

Joan Pope of Rome 856



A Woman Pope (as History doth tell)
 In High Procession once in Labour fell,
 And was Deliver'd of a Bastard Son; —
 Whence Rome some call The Whore of Babylon.

Joan Pope of Rome 856



A Woman Pope (as History doth tell)
 In High Procession once in Labour fell,
 And was Deliver'd of a Bastard Son; —
 Whence Rome some call The Whore of Babylon.

A
PRESENT FOR A PAPIST:
OR, THE
HISTORY
OF THE
LIFE
OF
POPE JOAN,
From her Birth to her Death;

PLAINLY PROVING,

Out of printed Copies and authentic Manuscripts of
POPIST WRITERS, and Others,

THAT A

Woman called JOAN was really Pope of ROME,
And was there delivered of a Bastard Son, in the open
Street, as she was going in solemn Procession.

Reprinted with Additions, and published for the In-
formation of the People of ENGLAND.

Was Pope two years and five months

— *Ridiculum Acri*
Fortius & melius magnas plerumque
Secat Res. —

HOR.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. F. and C. RIVINGTON, N^o 62,
St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1785.

By Humphrey Shuttleworth A.M.
Vicar of Preston in Lancashire.
and Father of the Bishop of Chichester

PRESENT TO
OF THE
H. H. T. O. R. Y

TO
FROM

TO
FROM

TO
FROM

TO
FROM

TO
FROM

TO
FROM

TO
FROM

TO
FROM

P R E F A C E.

THE Author of the following Treatise was a great lover of truth, and one who would have been highly preferred in the Church of *Rome*, could he have dispensed with her *Son's profitable sin of lying and equivocation*. In his time he was looked upon as a man intelligent and sagacious, yet of a meek and modest temper; one who valued truth so much, and the world so little, that all that knew him could do no less than approve and applaud his writings before they read them; and indeed, as to proving that there was a woman called *Joan*, who was Pope of *Rome*, he has a cloud of witnesses to avouch the truth of it, and not a Protestant among them, but all eminent pontifical writers, (*Propugnacula Romanæ Ecclesiæ*) whose works he laboriously searched, and has quoted faithfully; in which quotations you will find several men of note in the Romish Church have acknowledged, that there was a woman pope, and several to this day, to their own shame and confusion, must confess the truth of the story.

You must not expect a tenth part of this *lady errant's story* in this small tract; it is very probable, that a woman of such eminent learning and excellent parts, as she was endowed with,

P R E F A C E.

must have performed many memorable actions in the world, besides what are contained in her lascivious ramble with her gallant to the city of *Athens*, and from thence to *Rome*, in which place she behaved herself in all respects in masculine apparel, like a learned and holy man, till female frailty disgraced her papal dignity with a bastard, of which she was shamefully delivered in the open street, as she was going in procession, and both died instantly.

This fact remained unquestioned for above six hundred years; but since, through the cunning craftiness of those who lie in wait to deceive; through the incredulity, or rather the inattention of indolent, easy, lukewarm, or wavering Protestants, this story has become matter of doubt, so much as even by designing teachers to be represented as fabulous; it is presumed, that the following investigation of circumstances and facts, relative to that singular and extraordinary event, may not be thought altogether useless, or, at this season, unnecessary.

constitution, must console the truth of the story, and fervent to this day, to their own shame and acknowledged, that there was a woman pope, several men of note in the Roman Church have faithfully; in which questions you will find works he laboriously searched, and has quoted writers, (Frobenius, Romanus, Ertius) whose relation among them, but all eminent pontiffs

and excellent parts, as she was endowed with
T. H. E. that a woman of such eminent learning
exceeds any in this world, it is very pro-
You must not expect a tenth part of this lady

T H E
L I F E A N D D E A T H
O F
P O P E J O A N , &c.

J O H N E N G L I S H, or Pope *Joan*, as you may read in *Platina's Lives of the Popes*, was born of *English* parents, at a place called *Mentz*, in *Germany*, who concealing her sex in a masculine habit, being a young woman, travelled with a man of singular learning to *Athens*, whom she infinitely loved for his singular abilities, having sufficient ingenuity to qualify her for a judge in that particular. Such was her thirst for knowledge, that for some time she wholly banished her thoughts from every thing that had the least appearance of what was sensual, and applying herself solely to her study, in a little time she so improved herself in all Arts and Sciences, by conversing with the learned of those times, and with the assistance of her no less learned companion, that in Philosophy she had few equals; and a while after coming to *Rome*, in Theology she had as few superiors. By her indefatigable application and skill in Controversy, she soon obtained so much good-will and credit amongst all sorts of persons, that she was not only cried up for a great wit, but a man of unexampled holiness and piety; which high estimation of her became so

uncontroulably general even among the learned of those times, that *Leo* the IVth dying, by the consent of all, as *Martinus* saith, she was chosen Pope. Being hardly warm in her papal seat, her piety gave place to her concupiscence, in-somuch, that admitting either her learned fellow-traveller, or one of her menials, as some imagine, into her loose embraces, she conceived with child, and as she grew bigger, every day devised new inventions to conceal her pregnancy, so subtilly contrived, that this growing infamy was known to none but to him that was the cause of it. But unfortunately for her, not dreaming that her time approached so near, as she was going from the *Vatican* to *St. John's* of *Lateran* in procession, between *Nero's* Colosses and *St. Clement's*, she fell in labour, and was delivered of a son, and died in that very place, having sat as Pope, two years one month and four days, and was buried without the least honour and solemnity.

Jacobus Bergomenses differs little in opinion from the aforesaid relation, a man whom *Trithemius* (*Lib. de Ecclesiasticis Scriptoribus*) applauds for being well read in scripture, a famous Historiographer, and one that was wise, eloquent, and of a good life and conversation, and therefore we may credit such a person, who says, * *Johannes Septimus Papa*, &c. " *John* the " VIIth, by parents *English*, was created Pope, " next after *Leo*, and sat two years five months; " they say this was a woman, and that she went " very young out of *Athens*, with a learned

* *Supplement. Chron. lib. 11. ad Anno 858. Impres. Veneris, Anno 1486.*

" man

“ man that was in love with her; and that
“ thereby hearing good professors, she profited
“ so much, that coming to *Rome*, she had few
“ like her in divinity. Whereupon by her
“ reading, disputing, preaching and praying,
“ she got herself so much favour, that upon
“ *Leo's* death, she was chosen Pope in his room,
“ as many men say by common consent; but
“ it so fell out, that a while after, she was got
“ with child by one of her acquaintance, and
“ was delivered thereof in the time of her
“ papacy; for going from the *Vatican* to St.
“ *John Laterans* in procession, between the
“ *Colosses* and St. *Clement's*, child-birth pangs
“ seized her ere she was aware, and was deli-
“ vered in the high-street without the help of
“ any midwife; but she died presently, and
“ was buried without the least solemnity in the
“ same place, with her bantling lying by her.
“ Now, in detestation of so foul a fact, and for
“ the continuing the memory of so lewd an
“ action, the Popes to this day, when they go
“ in procession, to shew their dislike to the
“ place of her travail, which was in the midst
“ of her way, forsaking it, do turn into by-
“ lanes and by-streets, till they have left that
“ behind them, and then returning into the
“ same street again, they go forward with their
“ procession. And for avoiding the like mis-
“ chief for the future, it was decreed, that
“ none should be consecrated Pope before the
“ youngest Cardinal Deacon had tried by touch-
“ ing, (whilst the person to be consecrated set
“ on a close-stool) that he was a man.”

I am not ignorant how incredible this story appears to the Romanists, and how fabulous and ridiculous some have endeavoured to render it by their sophistry and forgery; which shameful practices we need not wonder at, if we consider how customary it is for them to avow manifest untruths, and deny known truths, especially if they produce any advantage to their persuasion; all which is as easy to prove, as to object against them, which though it may be demonstrated by divers particulars, viz. by Parsons and Bishops, denying that they call the Pope their Lord God: By *Bellarmin* denying that any Jesuit had any hand in the Gunpowder Treason: By their general denying that Pope *Honorius* the First was an Heretick, &c. Yet most apparently their impudence appears, in denying the report of a *Joan* that was a *quondam* Pope of *Rome*; which I shall endeavour to prove by a cloud of witnesses, not any of our own brethren, but the sons of the Romish Church, which purposely I have done for the greater confirmation of my arguments; for as *Novatian* says, "That is a strong proof which is wrung out of the Adversary, when the enemies of truth are driven to bear witness unto the truth." And as * another, *Amici contra amicum & inimici pro inimico invincibile testimonium est.* Which sounds thus, as I conceive; the testimony of a Papist against a Papist, and the testimony of a Papist for a Protestant, is without exception. If I have given an impartial and true account of this *Joan*, the Woman

* Vives de Instrument. probabilitatis.

Pope, manifestly proving there was such a person who sat in the Papacy, and died therein with infamy, against the surmises and objections made to the contrary by *Robert Bellarmin* and *Cæsar Baronius*, Cardinals; *Onuphrius, Harding, Saunders, Cope, Genebrard, Bernartius, Florimondus, Papius, Maso, Parsons, &c.* I would then have the Romanist lay aside all prejudice, and bear witness with me; but if he can bring more solid arguments to the contrary, I am ready to be convinced, being content to learn of him, if he can better inform my judgment, as * *St. Augustin* did of *Tychonius* the Hereuc. To conclude my *Proæmium* with all sincerity, I profess, that though it may be gathered from *Campion*, the Jesuit, that the Papists believe one Heaven cannot hold them and Protestants; tho' † *Coster* with strangely, that he may be damned with the Devil to all eternity, if any of us be saved; yet their uncharitableness and cruelty towards us from time to time, causelessly extended, shall work no such effect in me; but, on the contrary, I wish them well, and shall constantly pray for the welfare of their souls; that they may have eyes to see the truth, and candour to acknowledge it.

Give me leave now to come to the proof of this famous History of Pope *Joan*; and by the way, methinks I hear some opinionative obstinate Romanist say, that the whole Story of Pope *Joan*, is a mere fable, a ridiculous fiction, and so known to the more learned sort of Protestants among us; but that we will not leave

* Lib. 2. *Retract.* cap. 48. *Lucæ Osiandri* Proposit. 8, pag. ult.

† *Resp.* ad *Refutat.*

deluding

deluding the world with it, for want of other matters; besides that, there are so many improbabilities and moral impossibilities in this tale, as no man of any judgment, discretion, or common sense, will give credit thereto, but will easily see the vanity thereof. In a word, says one *, he was a knave that invented it, and he is a fool that believes it, especially if he compares it with what is written on the same subject by *Buchinger* in *Germany*, by *Charanza* in *Spain*, by *Omophrius*, *Bellarmin* and *Baronius* in *Italy*, by *Tarianus* and *Bernartius* in *Belgia*, by *Pontacus* in *Aquitania*, by *Genebrard* and *Papyrius*, *Massonus* in *France*, by *Saunders*, *Cope*, *Harding*, *Father Parsons*, and others, which were *English* men.

To all those particulars, and what else hath been objected, to prove the nullity of this history, I shall endeavour to answer and refute as mildly as the subject will permit. And first, did it not pass for current, *sans contradiction* till within somewhat more than a century of years, viz. till the year 1566, that *Omophrius*, the Friar, began to boggle at it? He was the first that ever by reason endeavoured to discredit the report, and yet confesses that many worthy men, as well as vulgar, believed it for a truth. And if the testimony of a multiplicity of Roman Authors be thought inadequate, what will they say to that image of this female Pope, which was placed amongst those of the other Roman Pontiffs in the famous Church of *Sienna*, which the Bishop of that place would not suffer

* *Fernartius* de utilitate legenda hist. lib. 2, p. 105.

to be defaced at the last repairing of that church, though strenuously urged to it by the Jesuits? Add to this, that Bishop *Burnet* in his Travels tells us of another statue of Pope *Joan*, which he saw at *Bologna*. "In the great square before *St. Petrone's* Church, (saith he) on the one side of which is the Legatè's palace, among other statues one surprized me much, which is Pope *Joan's*, which is so named by the people of the town. It is true, the learned say it is the statue of Pope *Nicholas IV.* who had indeed a youthly and womanish face. But as I looked at this statue very attentively, through a little prospect-glass that I carried with me, it appeared plainly to have the face of a young woman, and was very unlike that of Pope *Nicholas IV.* which is in *St. Mary Maggiore* at *Rome*: for the statue of that Pope, though it hath no beard, yet hath an age in it that is very different from the statue at *Bologna*."

Besides, was there not made of old, for fear of such like cheats and abuses, a stool of easement, on which Popes sat at their inauguration, for proof of their virility? Was there not a marble image set up as a monument thereof, in the place where she miscarried, viz. in one of the chief streets in *Rome*; which monument was likewise to be seen no longer ago than in the time of *Pius* the Fifth? Lastly, is it not written by men of their own persuasion, that all Popes when they go in procession, in detestation of that fact, go further about? To this the Romanists answer, it is not so much in detestation of any such supposed fact, that they leave the straight and

and nearer way to the *Lateran Church*, but because that street is a narrow winding street, and in that respect unfit for so great a train as accompanies the Pope to pass orderly through, as *Onuphrius*, *Bellarmin*, and *Remondus*, have observed. But if it be true what *Philippus Bergomensis* hath registered, this observation is false, *et omissio* (saith he) speaking of the Popes turning out of that place of the street wherein *Madam Joan* was delivered without the benefit of a warm bed, midwife, nurse, or caudle to comfort her, *Declinat ad diverticula vicisque, & sic loco detestabili postergato reintrantes, iter perficiunt*; leaving the way, they turn into by-lanes and by-streets; and as soon as they are beyond that detestable place, they turn into their way again, and so go on to the perfecting their procession. Now, if upon their leaving that street, they enter into by-lanes, &c. and having past that odious place, they turn in again; the reason why they leave that street cannot be because it is narrow and winding in and out, for doubtless these by-lanes are as narrow. And by their turning out and returning into the same way again, they wind as often in and out as if they went along through the same street, though it were very crooked. In confirmation whereof † *Platina*, who knew *Rome* very well, and was desirous enough to cover the Pope's nakedness herein, as much as he could with honesty, confesses that this is probable enough.

As to the marble image erected in *perpetuum rei memoriam*, † *Theodoricus de Niem*, who was

In Supplement. Chronol. Ann. 158. † De vitis Pontif; in vita Johan. 8. † *Lib. de privilegiis & juribus Imperii.*

formerly a secretary to a Pope, says, *adhuc vetus statua marmorea illic posita figurative monstrat hoc factum*; unto this day an old marble image, erected in that place, sheweth the matter under a figure. Here the Romanists have recourse to a slender evasion, acknowledging there was such a statue, but it resembled not in the least a woman lying-in, nor was the boy like a child in swaddling-clouts, but like one of some years.

This exception is to little purpose, for that was an ignorant, illiterate, and unskilful age, having perhaps had no more skill in statuary, carving, or painting, than they had, whom *Eliau* mentions, who were forced to write over or under their pictures, this is a bull, this an horse, and this a tree. *Aneas Sylvius* pointing to a more ingenious time than that of Pope *Joan*, condemns the painters and carvers thereof for notorious bunglers; thus, *If we could take a view of graven or painted images made two or three hundred years ago, you would find them portrayed not like men, but monsters and hobgoblins*; such an artist probably had the handling of Pope *Joan's* statue: however, as ill moulded as it was, *Pius Quintus* thought as it stood, that it discovered more than he willingly would have known, and therefore removed it, and cast it into the river *Tyber*; not because it disgraced the street, but *ut memoriâ illius aboleret*, that he might extinguish the memory of that shameful event; and this is not only witnessed by travellers, that were in *Rome*, but by *Elias * Hassenmuller*, formerly a member of the fiery order of *Jesuits*.

* *Historia Jesuitici Ordinis*, cap. 10. de *Jesuitarum Patre & Matre*.

Bellarmin in lib. de Rom. Pontif. will not allow of this *stool of easement*; for, says he, of a stool of easement to try the Pope's sex, there is no where any mention, *Onuphrius* averring that it is but an idle conceit of idle people; yet *Philippus Bergomensis*, a man of great learning and esteem in his time, (as *Trithemius* attests) records it as an undeniable truth, that there was such a thing; for upon mention made of Pope *Joan's* story, he says, for avoiding like error for the future, it was decreed that no man should be held for Pope, till the youngest Cardinal Deacon had found by trial, while he sat upon a stool of easement, that he was a man; which is likewise testified by * *Laonicus Chalcondilas*; for upon relation of that event, he thus proceeds, *Qua propter ne decipiantur iterum*; that is, lest they should be deceived again, they make proof of the Pope's manhood by feeling, and he that feels, makes it known by crying, *Our Lord and Master is a Man*. And *Sabellinus* writing the same matter, says, *There is to be seen at this day, in the Pope's palace, a marble chair, wherein the new Pope presently upon his election is set down; that as he sits, the lowest Deacon may make trial of his manhood by touching or feeling.*

As much may be read in *William Brewin*, who lived in the year 1470; for in † *Capella Salvatoris* (saith he) *In the chapel of our Saviour, there are two or more marble chairs with*

* *De rebus Turcicis*, lib. 6. pag. 98. † *Wilhelmus Brewin in Codice Manuscripto de 7. Ecclesiis principii Urbis Romæ.*

boles in them, wherein (as I heard) there they make proof whether the Pope be a man or no.

The Romanists confess there is such a chair, but never intended for the use afore recited; for (say they) he sits not therein in a corner, but in the great Church of *St. John Lateran*, where a vast concourse of people come to see him; where he is attended by the whole College of Cardinals, with many Embassadors of Kings and Princes; whereas a closer place was fitter for that purpose, and they might more conveniently have made trial of his manhood in the Conclave, wherein he was chosen, and so they did it seems; for presently upon their electing of him, before they proclaimed him *Pope*, they sate him in a chair in their Conclave, as you may read in the *book of holy ceremonies*, dedicated to *Leo the Tenth*, whereby you may see how idly * *Bellarmin* talks, (if I may be so bold to speak so of so great a Cardinal) who taking upon him to clear the point, never speaks of his sitting in the chair in the Conclave, but only of his sitting in other chairs at *St. John Lateran*, as though he had been chaired only publickly, and not in private, and that he himself had said sufficiently to the point in question, by proving, that in publick there was no such conclusion tried with the *Pope*; whereas the conclusion was tried in secret. Now, should you ask the question of any of them to what end does he sit in such a chair in publick, the reply will be, *That thereby he may be put in mind, that he is not God but Man: inasmuch as he stands in need of a close-stool as well*

* Lib. 3. de Rom. Pont. cap. 24.

as others; so says *Florimondus*: and indeed he hath need to be put in mind thereof. For though some Papists deny it shamefully, yet there have been Popish *Parasites*, * who have in plain terms called the *Pope* (as *St. Thomas* termed *Christ*, *Joh. xx. 28.*) their Lord and God; and there are still such, who give him such titles as are due to God alone, and rob God of some part of his power, to bestow it on him. See *Stapleton princip. fid. doctrin. præfat. ad Greg. 13. Plane supremum in terris numen.*

But it might be supposed the necessities of nature would have served to remind him of his humanity: thus *Antigonus* the elder (as † *Plutarch* relates) was convinced that he was a Man and not a God. Besides, they should not have intended such a mystery by such a ceremony; because they set him therein before he was in *Pontificalibus*: for till he be mitred, till he be crowned, till he have received the keys, whereby is denoted his power to bind and loose; and a rod, whereby is signified his power to punish; there should be no fear of forgetting himself. Again, had it not been better, if they had aimed at any such mark, to have caused a boy to come every morning unto the Pope's chamber door (after the example of *Philip King of Macedon*) who should have whipt him out of his bed, and bid him remember that he was mortal.

We see then, how industrious the Romanists are, in endeavouring to obliterate, or remove

* *N. D.* in his warn-word to *Sir Fr. Hastings's* Encounter, cap. 2. fol. 30. and Gloss. on Canon-Law, c. cum inter. verb. Declaramus. extrav. de verb. signif. † Part. 2. Moral. lib. de Iside & Osiride.

what-

whatever may assist the continuance of the memory of this Pope *Joan*; for as *Pius Quintus* threw into *Tyber* her marble image which stood in the street where she was delivered; so *Clement the Eighth*, by the persuasion of Cardinal *Baronius*, would have defaced her image in the Church of *Sienna*: now if the present Pope will but burn all the books too which are writ of Pope *Joan*, all evidences then will be totally lost, it would be easy for them to prove, that there was never such a *Pontifical Woman*. Ay, but (says the Papist) what if her image had stood still? Is there any reason, that we are thereby bound to believe there was such a Pope; if we believe Painters and Carvers, we should make fine work indeed; and so we shall, indeed, if we believe their Painters and Carvers; for we find the *Trinity* painted by them in the likeness of a man with three faces; sometimes like a man with two heads having a *Dove* between them; both which fashions of painting the *Trinity* is monstrous even in * *Bellarmin's* opinion. We find our Saviour *CHRIST* painted with long hair, as though he had been a *Nazarene* by vow, which conceit is controuled by † holy writ. We find him set on a weather-cock on the top of the Temple of *Jerusalem*, as though the Temple had a spire-steeple like ours, which is false. We find the Virgin *Mary* treading on the *Serpent's* head, which the scriptures foretold *CHRIST* himself should do. We find her richly apparelled in a gown of wrought gold;

* Lib. 2. de Imag. cap. 8. † For *Nazarites* must drink no wine, Numb. vi. 3. yet our Saviour did, *Matth.* xi. 19. and xxvi. 29.

B

whereas,

whereas, questionless her habit was very mean and ordinary; and with a pair of beads in her hand; whereas a thousand years after Christ, beads were not used throughout the world. Besides, their Painters recommend to us a *Saint on Horseback*, whom they call *George*, and another on foot, as big as a Giant, whom they call *Christopher*, and a *She-Saint* broken on a wheel, whom they call *Catharine*, and a fourth drawn in pieces by horses, nick-named *Hippolitus*: whereas in all antiquity there is no mention made of any such *Saints*. Therefore, we have no reason barely to believe painting and carving; but if book-proof or tradition concur with them, we may give some credit to them. * *Bel-larmin* himself is of the opinion, *That there can be no error in substance, as long as (besides book-proof) there are monuments of stone or of brass for the proof of any antient report.* Thus, if he speaks the words of truth, the truth is with us; for, besides the monuments of stone, we have the testimonies of many authentic writers; amongst whom, *Charanza*, a *Spaniard*, who, *Florimondus* says, disproved the story of Pope *Joan* before he undertook the task himself; but these are his words, † *Johannes VIII. Papa 105. sub Petro sedit An. 2. Mens. 1. Dies 4. de hoc ferunt, quod malis artibus Pontificatum adeptus est, quoniam cum esset fœmina, sexum mentitus est; Et postea à servo compressa, doloribus circumventa, mortua est:* In *English* thus, " *John* " the eighth Pope of that name, and the 105th " Pope from *St. Peter*, sat two years one month

* Lib. 2. de Rom. Pont. cap. 11. † In Sum. Conc. p. 370. Edît. Paris, 1564.

“ four days. They report of this person, that
 “ he got the Papacy by evil means, because
 “ he feigned himself to be a man, whereas in
 “ truth he was a woman, who being afterwards
 “ begot with child by one of her servants, fell
 “ in travail, and died therein.”

* *Kirantius*, who is recommended by *Pontanus* for a famous Historiographer, and one that writ before *Luther's* time, and is therefore the less to be suspected for partiality, says thus, *Johannes Anglicus ex Maguntia mulier, mentita sexum, &c.* “ *John English*, a woman of *Mentz*, dissembled
 “ her sex, and being of a quick wit, and volu-
 “ ble tongue, and one that could talk scholasti-
 “ cally, she won the hearts of all men, so that
 “ she arrived to the dignity of Pope, no man
 “ knowing any other but she was a man, save
 “ one of her servants, who afterwards got her
 “ with child: they say she was delivered near
 “ the *Colosses*, before she had sat two years
 “ compleat.”

Mantuan, who is commended by *Tritbemius* for an excellent Theologist, a knowing Philosopher, and a famous Poet, the only man in all *Italy* in his time, hath this story in his description of *Hell*; and describing what manner of persons were there, he saith,

*Hic pendeat adhuc sexum mentita virilem,
 Fœmina, cui triplici Phrygiæ diadematæ, mitram
 Extollebat apex & pontificalis adulter.*

*Here hangs a woman, once who pass for man,
 Who truckt for breeches, petticoats, and fan.*

* *Mitrop.* l. 2. Edit. Colon. 1574. & *Francos.* 1590.

By her great parts, she gain'd with much renown,
 The Phrygian mitre, with the triple crown.
 Here hangs that Lecher too, by whom 'tis said,
 The Woman Pope did lose her maidenhead,
 And in the street sans midwife brought to-bed.

Achilles Gassar, in his *Epitome* of all Histories and Chronicles, collected out of the best Historiographers, writes thus, * *John the Eighth*, by Country English, by calling a Pope, yet by sex a woman, sat shamefully as Pope two years and six months.

Ravifus Textor, in his *Officina*, writes thus, *Scitum ex Chronicis, &c.* "It is a thing well known by the *Chronicles*, and written by our ancestors, that *John English*, from her youth upward, deported herself in every respect like a man, and at length, by I know not what destiny, certainly by very great fortune, she became Pope, and sat about two years after *Leo the Fourth*, and nobody knew this fallacy and deceit till she was with child by one of her menial servants, and delivered thereof:" and † *Fulgosus*, who was a noble and learned man, and sometimes *Duke of Genoa*, affirms the same story for a truth, saying, that *John the Eighth* was at length detected to be a woman.

Laziardus is of the same opinion; so is *Hartmannus Schedel*, a Doctor of Physic, yet not ignorant of holy Scriptures, nor atheistically inclined, yet by *Florimondus*, he is accused for being one of the brood of the *Hussites*, and lived

* *Achilles Gassar*, in *Epit. Hist. &c.* Antwerp, 1536.

† *De dictis factisque memorabilibus*, lib. 8. cap. 3. Tit. de foeminis quæ doctrina excel.

in *Nuremberg* when that city was infected with *Husse's* Heresy, and therefore would fain persuade his party that no credit is to be given to him, because whatever he writ concerning the Popedom of *Joan the Woman* was partial. In answer to this, I rather believe *Florimondus* to be one of the brood of abominable liars; for *Hartmannus Schedel*, born in *Nuremberg*, was * Student in *Padua*, where he was created Doctor of Physic by the great *Matthiolus*; and he was so far from *Husse's* opinion, that in the same book quoted in the margin, he hath inserted one whole chapter about the Heresy of the *Hussites*, and their original. † *Volateran*, an Historiographer of good note, makes no doubt of the reality of this story; and *Tritheimius*, Abbot of St. Martin's Monastery in *Spanheim*, a reverend, well read, and very learned man writes thus, *In the same year that Pope Leo died, John English succeeded for two years and five months.* Now, some say she was a woman, and that she was known so to be but to one only, who was her servant, by whom at length she became pregnant, and was delivered in the open street. For this cause some would not reckon her among the number of Popes, disliking this villainous action: with whom, in matter of fact, corresponds *Sabellicus*, a man ‡ of great esteem in *Venice*, yea the most famous in his time for all manner of learning; of whose

* Ego *Hart. Schedel*, Doctor Patavinus, &c. circa Anno 1440, f. 252.

† *Anthropologia*, lib. 22. pag. 503. edit. Basil. 1556.

‡ *Sabellicus* vir undecunque doctissimus claret hodie apud Venetos. *Tritheimius* lib. de Script.

books, *Pius* the Third professed he valued as much, as *Alexander* did *Homer's* *Iliads*.

Wernerus Roleunick, who is reckoned by *Paulus Langius* among the most famous of the *Order of Carthusians*, and commended by *Trithemius* for a man of profound learning and singular devotion, in confirmation of what is aforesaid, writes thus: * "This *John*, by surname, *English*, by " his country, of *Mentz*, is reported to have sat " as Pope about this time: and she was a wo- " man, but went in man's apparel. She pro- " fited so well in divinity, that she had no fel- " low, and so was chosen to be Pope; but after " a while, being great with child, as she went " in public procession, she was delivered there- " of, and died. And this seems to be the sixth " Pope to this day, which was called *Holy* and " proved nought: and therefore he was plagued " by God, as the rest before him were plagued, " neither is she in the register of Popes." Hence some say, because she was a *German*, a *German* is not permitted to be elected Pope; but this is manifestly false, for since that time several *Germans* have been advanced into the Pope- dom.

Mattheus Palmerius, † an *Italian*, and one of the choicest men which were at the Council kept by *Eugenius* the IV. against the Council of *Brasil*; *Pontifex* 106. *Stephen* the 9th, and *Gregory* V. saith, " *John* was a woman, yet not " known so to be, but to one of her familiars, " who lay with her; she was delivered in the " time of her Papacy, and because some reckon

* Fasciculus Temp. ætate 6 ad annum, 854. † Tri- themius de Script. Ecclesiast.

" her

“ her not among the Popes, there are no more “ *Johns* for her, than if she had never been.” The account that *B. Platina* gives of this *learned Whore*, or, as Mr. *Fox* calls her, the *Whore of Babylon*, is contradicted by some, and supposed to be never written by the author aforesaid, but foisted in, so *Bernartius* conjectures; and to confirm his groundless supposition, (saith he) * *Antonius Hetweeld*, a man of good report, and Alderman of *Louvain*, told me, that one *Engelbertus Boonius*, a reverend German Dean, had oftentimes told him, that he had seen many ancient manuscripts of *Platina* in the *Vatican of Rome*, and perused them diligently, and yet found not any mention made of this Pope *Joan*.

Surely this reverend Dean was fortunate in finding such ancient manuscripts, as the Alderman of *Louvain* informed *Bernartius* of; but how comes it that neither *Onuphrius*, *Platina*, *Commentator*, *Bellarmin*, nor *Baronius*, who have had as free access into the *Vatican Library* as any, could never light on these manuscripts as well as he? And how comes it, that none since *Bernartius* thought good to except in that manner against *Platina*? The acknowledgment of those two pillars of the *Romish Church*, *Bellarmin* and *Baronius*, with *Onuphrius*, that this story is originally in *Platina*, induceth me to believe, that either *Bernartius* belied the Alderman, the Alderman belied the Dean, or the Dean made a fool of the Alderman, and made the other so too by consequence: for undoubtedly had there been any such manuscripts, some

* *Bernartius de utilitate legendæ hist. lib. 2. p. 111.*

of them would have found them out, and made them public to wipe off that infamy they more than barely stand suspected of.

Since then it is evident, that *Platina* did write the life of this *Lady Errant Joan*, who coming from *Athens*, became at *Rome* a teeming Pope; the Romanists have endeavoured to find another hole to creep out at; denying that he writ by public authority, and did not take his history out of the public registers of the church. The belief of this is an error, and a gross one too; for * *Platina* himself professes, that he writ by the command of *Sextus* the Fourth; and *Onuphrius*, that he followed *Damasus*, *Anastatius*, and such historiographers, as had written before of the same matter. But, says *Florimondus*, “*Platina* reported it rather to shew his reading, than for that he thought it true; for, (says he) had he imagined it true, he would have exaggerated it, and made the worst on it, that thereby he might have revenged himself of the Popes, at whom he was grievously incensed. For *Paul* the Second, (continues he) which all men know racked him, and divested him of all his dignities, and justly casting him into prison, kept him there as long as himself lived.” To this I answer, that he was racked and imprisoned by *Paul* the Second, is true, but that it was justly done is false; for *Tritheimius* chargeth that Pope for so doing with cruelty.

Yet suppose all were true, doth it follow in *Florimondus*’s Logic, that because *Paul* the Second wronged *Platina*; ergo, *Platina* hated all

* Proemio lib. de vitis Pontif. in Epistola ad Ziftum 4.
Popes?

Popes? And why not then. *Sixtus* the Fourth gratified *Platina* many ways, setting him at liberty, and restoring him his dignities; *ergo*, *Platina* loved all Popes for his sake? If one man's kindness could not work love towards all, neither is it likely that one man's unkindness should breed hatred or heart-burning against all; therefore, notwithstanding this, we may well think, that *Platina* wrote what he thought, and the rather, for that in the words following, he professes * that such a thing may likely happen.

That I may not seem deficient in the production of testimonies for the farther probation of this story, give me leave to insert some more; amongst none of the meanest, observe what *Chalcocondelis* says, "It is well known, that a certain woman was made Pope, by reason they knew not her sex. For all (almost) in the western parts of *Italy*, have their beards. Now when she was great with child, and came abroad to solemnize some day, or to say service; as she was at service, she was delivered of a child in the sight of all the people. Wherefore lest hereafter they should be deceived in like sort, they make trial of his manhood by touching, and he that toucheth proclaimeth, WE HAVE A MAN TO OUR POPE."

These words are allowed by them to be in the *Latin translation*, but *Baronius* will not admit of them in the *Greek*; for, (says he) *Clauserus*, his interpreter, added in his translation this story, which is not to be found in the *Greek copy*: and for further persuasion, to make men believe

* Apparet ea quæ dixi ex his esse, qui fieri posse creduntur, lib. 6. pag. 98.

it, he says, that *Florimondus* hath excellently well discovered the couſenage of *Clauserus*; for comparing *Clauserus*'s tranſlation in *Latin*, with a *Frenchman*'s tranſlation of the ſame in his mother-tongue, by that he found the tale was not in *Calchocondilas*; for there was not one word of it in the *French* tranſlation. But why may not the *Frenchmen* leave it out as well as *Clauserus*? It may be objected, (but how truly I know not) that this *Frenchman* was a faithful tranſlator, and durſt not have left it out, if he had found it in the *Greek*, as *Florimondus* notes? And why may we not hold *Clauserus*, as faithful an interpreter as the *Frenchman*, yea, more faithful, ſeeing the *Frenchman* was a *Papiſt*? For * *Papiſts* hold it lawful in tranſlating, to omit offensive matter, and ſo doth no *Proteſtant*. If *Florimondus* or *Baronius* could have informed us where a man might have ſeen a *Greek* copy in which it is not, they had ſaid ſomething to purpoſe, but to go about to diſapprove it by a tranſlation of one of their own creatures, they argue ridiculoſly; and if any of them gainſay, that in the weſtern parts of *Italy*, all (almost) ſhawe not their beards, as ſome have made that vain oppoſition, it is eaſily answered: for by the pope's canons, the *Italian* prieſts, yea, all the prieſts of the weſtern church, are to be ſhawn; ſo ſaith † *Pontacus*, "Pope *Anicetus* commanded the Clergy to ſhawe both their heads and their beards, in token that they were of the Clergy." And, "Pope *Gregory* the Seventh avouches, that

* *Gretſer* lib. 2. de jure, &c. prohib. lib. malos, cap. 10.
 † *Chronogr.* lib. 2.

" from

“ from the Apostles days, the western Clergy
 “ did shave their beards,” to whom * *Durandus*,
 who lived about the year 1280, subscribes.
 For he acknowledges, that before, and in his
 time, they were shaved; proving the lawfulness
 of it out of *Ezekiel*, and shewing the mysteries
 which it imports. *Johannes Pierius Valerianus*,
 attests the same; imputing the error of electing
 Pope *Joan* to the ordinary shaving of beards,
 because by that means one could hardly know a
 man from a woman.

For further proof of the truth of this story,
 it will be expedient to give you an account what
Theodoricus de Niem (secretary to a Pope) re-
 lates. † “ *John*, called *English*, was a woman
 “ born at *Mentz*, and she studied at *Athens*, ap-
 “ parelled like a man, where she profited so
 “ well in the arts, that coming to *Rome*, she
 “ read there the liberal sciences, and was held
 “ so sufficient a reader, that many of the better
 “ sort became her hearers; afterwards with one
 “ consent she was chosen Pope, and lived in
 “ that dignity two years and upwards: but tak-
 “ ing herself more than before to idleness and
 “ pleasure, she could not live so continently as
 “ she did, in her mean, yet studious condition:
 “ whereupon one day as she went with the
 “ Clergy and people of *Rome*, (according to the
 “ custom of that time) in solemn procession,
 “ being attired in the usual papal ornaments,
 “ she was delivered of her first begotten son,
 “ (the father whereof was her servant) near the
 “ Temple of Peace, which stands in the city;

* Rational. Divin. Offic. 2. de Ministris, &c. † De
 Privilegiis & juribus imperii.

“ as

“ as it is evident by an old marble image which
 “ stands there to this day, to denote so much in
 “ a figure. And hereupon it is, that when the
 “ Popes go from the *Vatican* to *St. John's of*
 “ *Lateran*, and back again; they go not the di-
 “ rect way thither, but by other streets farther
 “ about, and so make their journey longer.”

I shall relate nothing of what *Petrarch*, *Boccace*, *Lucidus*, and our countryman *Higden* says to this purpose, since there are none so obstinate, but will confess they all have writ thereof, but only a little of what * *John Paris* writes as to this matter, who lived about the year 1280, and read publicly in the University of *Paris*, with great and deserved commendation, as well in divinity as humanity: he shewing how sometimes a man may lawfully dispute, and take exception against the Pope, in respect of his person †, notes, that such a person may be chosen as is not capable: “ As for example, (saith he) “ if he prove a woman, or an Heretic, as some “ have done, who in that respect are not reckoned in the catalogue of the Popes.”

What an infinite number of witnesses could I produce to verify this story, whose testimonies, though ever so clear, yet the *Roman* opposers of truth, will cavil at. *Martinus Polonus*, because he hath writ the truth concerning Pope *Joan*, (for no other reason that I can find) they call *simple, ignorant man, given to vanity, and only famous for fables*; for that is ‡ *Bernartius*

* Trithem. de Script. Eccles. & Possevinus in apparatu Sacro Verbo, *Johan. Parisensis*. † De Potestate Regia & Papali. ‡ *Martinus Polonus* fabulis tantum celebris, cætero obscurus homo.

his censure of him. See the rashness of a later generation of Papists; for * *Polonus* was an Archbishop, and plenipotentiary to the Pope; he was learned in the Holy Scriptures, and not ignorant of secular learning; he was one whom *Platina* relied much on for matter of history, and was applauded by him as a man of a good life and conversation. He was the man, whom the author of *Fasciculus Temporum*, and *Jacobus Bergomensis*, two good historiographers, professed that they followed especially; and yet he is abused for speaking the truth.

To add further testimony, *Marianus Scotus*, who was born in the year 1028, † a man of estimation whilst he lived, and when dead held as a saint, and by *Baronius* styled a worthy chronologer, in his chronicle thus speaks, "Leo the Pope died in the kalends of *August*; after him succeeded *Joan*, a woman, who sat two years, five months, and four days." ‡ *Bel-larmin* contradicts this, saying, that He who published *Krantius Metropalis* at *Cologne*, in the year 1574, doth witness, that "in the ancient copies of *Marianus Scotus*, there is no mention made of Pope *Joan* the woman." What this *He* should be that gives this testimony, I never yet could learn, nor that he was a man of any credit; besides, there is no reason that a nameless *Sin*, a Mr. *Anonymous*, should be credited against printed copies, especially if it be

* Archiep. Cofentinus & Pœnitentiarius Papæ Possivin. Apparatus facer verbo Martinus Polonus. † Ab omnibus honore habebatur & non sine opinione sanctitatis sepelitur, Trithemius de Script. Ecclesiasticis. ‡ Lib. 4. de Rom. Pont. cap. 24.

true, which * *Bellarmin* saith in another case :
 " A man without a name, is without credit :"
 And, " A Canon out of a council, whose name
 " is not known, may very well be slighted."
 But the reason why *Bellarmin* did not name him,
 was not because he was ignorant of his name,
 but because he was but a mean fellow, a printer,
 a poor batchelor of the law, a man of slender
 reputation ; for he is named in the first page of
 the book *Ferwinus Calenius Lippiensis* : and
 what was such a fellow to run away with a story
 of this consequence upon his bare word in this
 manner ; † *Quæ hic author*, &c. " That this
 " which the author hereof reports touching
 " Pope *Joan*, is but counterfeit stuff, devised to
 " make the Pope odious ; to say nothing of such
 " proofs as *Onuphrius* gives in his annotations on
 " *Platina*, *Martianus*, *Scotus*, and *Sigibert*, do
 " testify, whose manuscripts remaining on re-
 " cord, discover their falshood who have chopt
 " his tale into their printed volumes ;" which
Bellarmin, nor any other, durst or dare avouch,
 the contrary being confessed directly by *Baro-*
nus : ‡ *Sigibert's* words are these, " The report
 " is, that this *John* was a woman, and that one
 " only who laid with her, knew so much ; and
 " that at length, even in the time of her papacy,
 " she was delivered of a child. Whereupon
 " it is that some reckon her not among the
 " Popes, and that there is not one Pope *John*
 " the more in number for her." Notwithstanding
 this, the Romanists deny, that there is any

* Lib. 4. de Rom. Pont. cap. 13. † Annotat. in
 lib. *Krantii Metro.* ‡ In chronico ad An. 184. print-
 ed at *Paris*, 1513.

such thing in the antient, true, and approved copies of *Sigibert*, and if there be any such thing found, some paltry fellow, (as *Bernartius* notes) hath been tampering with his writings, and that *Sigibert* never writ it, is fully witnessed by *Genebrard*. Pray here observe the Canonists, (when Popes alledge Popes for proof) do note, that it is *familiaris probatio*; meaning, it may be as much as that in the proverb, *Ask my fellow if I be a thief*. But say they in the monastery of *Gemble* in *Flanders*, there is extant the original of *Sigibert*, which wants this story; and for proof hereof, they have the oath of one *Protasius*, a *Franciscan*, who saw it, and there, (as he saith) *Sigibert* lived, there he wrote this book with his own hands, there he left it after life as a monument of his love. There it is shewn by the Monks, to such as come thither, for a piece of excellency and rarity.

Now judge you whether this paltry Frier is to be believed before * *Trithemius*, who, (says he) lived not there when he writ the book, for he writ that and many others in the monastery of *St. Vincent*, within the city of *Metensis*.

The Monks shewing this book as *Sigibert's* own to all comers, is a very slender argument to prove that it is his: for I have read of † a Monk, who gave out that he had brought from the east some of the sound of the bells which hung in *Solomon's* temple; and ‡ that he could shew among other relics, some of the hairs which fell from

* De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis Sigibertus cum in Canobio. 8. Vincentio Metensi ad instruend. pueros esset positus scripsit. Hist. I. † Virgerius Annot. in Catalog. hæret. Romæ conflatum, An. 1559. fol. 17. ‡ Ibid.

the *Seraphical Angel*, when he came to imprint the *five wounds* of *Christ* in *St. Francis's* body; and I have * read of others, who shew the Pilgrims who go to *Jerusalem*, a three-cornered stone, assuring them it is that very stone whereof *David* spoke, saying, *The stone which the builders refused is the head of the corner*, *Psal. cxviii. 22.*

Now as Monks and Papists strive to deceive others, so they are often cheated themselves; for many of them verily believe they have that which they have not. Do not many of them persuade themselves that they have that *Syndon* wherein *Christ's* body was lapped, when it was interred, wherein, (as they say) is to be seen to this day the picture of *Christ*? Others think they have the nails wherewith *Christ* was nailed to the cross, and in like manner are they deceived in a thousand several sorts of relicks.

But grant that this story of *Pope Joan* is not to be found in some copies of *Sigibert*, that does not argue that it was never writ by him; it is probable it may be left out by some who have transcribed his manuscript, which we may as well be induced to believe, and upon as good grounds as that the words of *Ælfricus*, which oppose transubstantiation, were cut out of a fragment of an epistle of his in the library of *Worcester*, as † *Mr. Fox* proves apparently. Thus is this story of *Pope Joan* cut out of a very fair manuscript of *Ranulfus Cestrensis*, which is now to be seen in the library of *New-College* in

* *Bellonus* obser. lib. 2. cap. 83. † *Act. & Monum. Allegations against the six articles*, p. 1304. Edit. 1570.

Oxford: we need not wonder at such unfair proceedings of the Papists, since they give direction, * *Qua fama proximorum, &c.* "That such things should be altered, or expunged, which tend to the discredit of the clergy;" and doth not this touch their ecclesiastick estate to the very quick? Doth not *Possevin* advise, that the † note in *John Nevison* the lawyer, which makes mention of Pope *Joan*, should be razed out? *Dele* (saith he) "blot it out (saith *Possevin*) because *John*, this woman was a meer *Chimæra*, and a forgery of calumniators."

For further proof that this *John* was a meer fiction, Cardinal *Baronius* would make us believe, that those of the best credit in history, and who have writ most of her, do not positively aver that there was such a woman Pope; but make their report of her with a *sic aiunt*, or *an ut asseritur*, but he brings no other proof thereof then *teste me ipso*; which however it may go for proof among Princes, yet is no proof among scholars; and for my part, without proof I will believe nothing, let who will be the assertor, especially if he be a Papist. As ‡ *Sigismund* the Emperor, said of *Julian* the Cardinal Legate at the Council of *Basil*, when one commended him highly to him, *tamen Romanus est*; yea, but he is a Roman.

But suppose it be so as *Baronius* saith it is, why may it not be true though it be delivered

* Index lib. prohib. per Clementem VIII. de Correct. lib. † *Johannes Nevison*, Sylva Nuptialis, page 319. ‡ *Rerum Memorab. Paralipom. Hist. Abbat. Ursperg. annex*, page 394.

with an *ut afferitur*? Thus it is said? I confess that many lies, nay gross ones too, pass in such general terms. As for example, *Mensay* (saith the Popish golden Legend) that *St. Patrick* drove with his staff all the venemous beasts out of Ireland; and, that he obtained of the Lord, that no Irish man should abide the coming of *Anti-Christ*; the former of which *Harpfield Cope* confessed to be a lie, and so I think all understanding Papists acknowledge the latter; else why do none of the learned Clergy of the Church of *Rome* alledge it, to clear the Pope from being *Anti-Christ*. Men say (saith *Nangiacus*, as *Genebrard* reporteth) that *Kentish* men have tails like brute beast, because their ancestors mocked *Austin* the Monk when he came to preach among them; nay, by some this is believed as a truth to this day; that this is a lie, there is nothing more evident, and yet this is reported with a *so 'tis said*.

But again. The worst Christians in *Italy* are the Romans; that of the Romans, the Priests are most wicked; and of the Priests, the lewdest are made Cardinals, and the baddest chosen to be Pope; * it is written, but with *afferitur*; yet to the skilful in history, and such as are acquainted with the affairs of *Rome*, this doth not seem improbable. In *Bavaria* *palam ferunt* (saith † *Hassen Muller*) "They say openly in "*Bavaria*, that the Jesuits caused a tub to be "*carried to their College, which breaking by "*the way, a wench dropt out of the end of it "*into the open street:*" and why may not this be

* *Sir Edw. Sands*, of the Religion used in the *West*, pag. 91. † *Lib. 2. de verbo Dei*, cap. 16.

true,

true, though it go but by report. The Papists believe far more incredible reports than this, which tend to the defamation of Protestants.

If any should object, that there were many learned men, and great writers who lived in her time, and some time after, who though they were the authors of several books, yet make no mention of any woman that ever was Pope of Rome. Besides *Rupertus*, an *English* Bishop, who, because he was excommunicated by the Pope, invented and raked together all manner of lies against the Pope, yet notwithstanding objected not this.

This objection may be answered in a word, thus: That most of all those authors who are quoted by the Romanists to have made no mention of Pope *Joan* were no Historiographers, but such who employed their pen and time in the study of Philosophy or Divinity; and therefore it is no more a wonder that these learned men should be silent, as to this matter, than for a Mathematician to write of lines and tangents only, and not to write of Pharmacy and Physic. Again, this *Rupertus* (commonly called *Groftbead*) well skilled in *Greek* and *Latin*, a Reader of Divinity in the Schools, an excellent Preacher, and a man so eminent for a holy life and conversation, that it was the opinion of the whole Clergy of *England* and *France*, that there was not such another among the Prelates of that time; yet *Innocent* the IVth, called him old fool, and absurd fellow, and his reproaches were attended with menaces. The reason is apparent, in that he opposed the Pope, and had divers cavils with him, insomuch that in one

letter he did not stick to tell him plainly, " That
 " by his writs with (*non obstante*) he brought a
 " deluge of mischief on the world, whereby
 " the purity of the Church was defiled, and the
 " quietness of the republick impeded and de-
 " stroyed; that by his reservations, commen-
 " does, and provisions of benefices for Parsons,
 " who sought to fleece, and not to feed the
 " flock of God, he committed such a sin, so
 " contrary to the doctrine of the Apostles and
 " Evangelists, so hateful and detestable to Christ
 " Jesus, as never sin was, but the sin of *Lucifer*,
 " nor never shall be but the sin of Anti-Christ,
 " whom the Lord shall destroy with the breath
 " of his mouth at his coming. He further
 " signified, that no man could with a good con-
 " science obey any such mandates as he sent a-
 " broad, though they came from the highest
 " Order of Angels; for they tended not to
 " edification, but the utter ruin of the Church."

Are these lies, by reporting whereof he sought
 to revenge himself on that present Pope? Sure
 it cannot be, since the * College of Cardinals
 confessed before the Pope, that they could not
 blame him for writing thus, having said nothing
 but what was justifiable. And here give me
 leave to recite what another, *Matthew Paris*,
 hath registered to posterity concerning Popes
 and Papists. In his History of *England*, in the
 life of *William* the Conqueror, in the year
 1072, page 10. he reports how *Satanas*, & *om-
 nes contubernium inferorum*; that the Devil and

* Ut vera fateamur vera sunt quæ dicit, *said the Cardi-
 nals*, *Mat. Paris*, p. 1192.

all his hellish crew writ letters gratulatory to all the rabble of the *Romish* Clergy, acknowledging their kindness, in that following their pleasures, and desisting from instructing the people, they suffered more souls to go to Hell than ever went before.

* That *Gregory* the VIIth, set the whole Church in an uproar by deposing married Priests from their priesthood, and forbidding the Laity to hear them say service, because he had no precedent for so doing; and because as some thought it was unadvisedly done, contrary to the opinion of the antient fathers, who wrote that the Sacraments of the Church, by the invisible working of the Spirit have like effect, whether they be administered by good or bad men. † He reports how a Cardinal Legate, at a Council held in *London*, inveighing against the misses or wenches of the Clergy, was taken the same night after in bed with a whore, or *Bona Roba*.

‡ He reports, how *Germanus*, Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople*, informed the Cardinals of *Rome*, that the *Grecians* stumbled much at this; that the Cardinals desired to be accounted his disciples, who said, silver and gold I have none, and yet none so rich and covetous as they.

§ He reports how the Pope enjoined by one mandate to the Bishops of *Canterbury*, *Lincoln*, and *Salisbury*, that they should provide for three hundred *Romans* in benefices next vacant;

* Ibid. An. 1074. † In *Hen.* 1. ad An. 1125. page 93. ‡ In *Hen.* 3. page 617. § In *Hen.* 3. p. 712. ad An. 1240.

and they should dispose of no benefice, till so many were compleatly provided for.

* He reports, how *Hugh* the Cardinal bragged, when *Innocentius* departed from *Lyons*, that whereas there were four stews, or houses, at his coming thither, he had left them but one, and that reached but from one end of the town to the other.

† He reports, how the *Franciscans* and *Minores* by command from the Pope, appointed all sorts of people, young and old, men and women, sound and sick, and of all conditions, to go for the recovery of the *Holy Land*; and yet the same day, or a little time after, for money dismissed them again.

He reports, how *Innocentius* the IVth, instigated the people of *Brabant* and *Flanders*, to commence a war against *Conradus* the Emperor, promising them for so doing forgiveness of all their sins; yea, not only a pardon for their own sins, but the like for their relations.

These, and the like stories he records against the Pope, being manuctested thereunto by truth itself; but he meddles not with any thing which was done by any Pope within a hundred years after Christ; and therefore it is no wonder that he speaks nothing of Pope *Joan*.

That I may not omit any material objection that the Romanists alledge to disprove the verity of the story of Pope *Joan*, I must here inform the reader, that as they say many learned *Latin* writers say nothing of her, so *Greek* Historiographers, *Zonaras*, *Cedrenus* *Caropalatas*, and

* In *Hen.* 3. page 1089. † In *Hen.* 3. page 1100.

others who wrote before *Martinus Polonus*, concerning the *Latin* Church, and were enemies to the same, and would have been glad of such an advantage against it, write nothing thereof at all; from whence some infer there was no such matter.

To answer this argument, I must beg this question; doth not *Platina* confess there was a Pope called *Mark*, who sat two years eight months and ten days; and another Pope called *Marcellus*, who sat above five years; and yet * *Pontacus*, and † *Genebrard* confess, that all the *Greek* writers in a manner omit to speak of the former; and that all *Greek* writers without exception omit to speak of the latter. Now if we should be persuaded (notwithstanding their passing by these in silence) that these were Popes, why may we not as well believe that there was a Pope *Joan*, though they pass her by in like manner, not speaking one word of her; we may believe many things of which they write not a syllable. We read in the *Golden Legend*, ‡ *Breviary*, &c. that *Heraclius* the Emperor, when he would have entered in by the gate, by which our Saviour went to his passion, clad in his royal robes with the cross on his shoulders, was miraculously hindered and could not get through, till he had divested his body of it's princely apparel, and put off his shoes and stockings. This is verily believed by many Romanists; and yet *Gretzar* saith, that the *Grecians*, *Zonaras*, *Cedrenus*, and the like,

* Lib. 2. Chronogr. † Chronol. lib. 3. ‡ Breviar. Rom. in officio exalt. S. Crucis.

write nothing of it, yet professeth withal he likes it never the worse for their silence; for they (as he farther observes) omitted many other material truths, whereof no man of reason will ever call them in question; and though *Hermannus Contractus*, *Conradus*, *Urspergensis Abbas*, and others, speak nothing of this *Joan*, we must not therefore conclude that there was never such a woman once a Pope. Do arguments taken from authority of few men hold negatively? It is a good argument, *St. Paul*, *St. Luke*, and *Seneca* do not say that *St. Peter* was at *Rome*? Ergo, *St. Peter* was not at *Rome*. I answer with * *Bellarmin*, negative arguments are worth nothing; for it follows not that *St. Peter* was never at *Rome*, because *St. Luke*, *St. Paul*, and *Seneca* do not report that he was ever there: for these three were not bound to report all that was true. Certainly (saith one) *magis credi debet tribus*: "A man should rather believe three witnesses speaking to a cause, than numbers who speak neither *pro* nor *con*." Again, *Denis* Bishop of *Athens*, was afterwards Bishop of *Paris*, though *Ado* Bishop of *Triers* in *Germany*, and *Suidas*, a *Greek* author, make no mention of his removal to another Bishoprick. *Lipomannus* resolves upon *Metaphrastes*, and one *Michael Syngelus*, in these words, that *Denis* was Bishop of *Paris*, though *Ado* and *Suidas* say nothing of it. Why then though these and many more say nothing of Pope *Joan*, might there not be such a Pope, since as many, and as learned as they, do place her in the

* *Lib. de Rom. pontif. cap. 8.*

number of Popes. * *Salmeron* a learned Jesuit saith thus, *quando unus*; "When one Historian reports what another passed by, the latter's silence doth not prejudice the truth of the other's relation."

I must confess, there is not a word of her in all those six or seven tables which are in the *Vatican*; yet suppose these tables be of greatest estimation, yet shall we conclude that he that is as Pope registered therein was a Pope; I know not how safely we may believe it, since *Baronius* condemns such for silly credulous people, who believe reports the rather because they are to be found in books belonging to the Pope's Library. Besides, *Leo* the VIIIth is registered in the catalogue of Popes, and in some of those seven tables, if not in them all; yet † *Baronius*, and his followers conclude him an intruder and usurper, and did not in the least deserve that glorious title of a Pope. Now if this be no good argument, *Leo* the VIIIth is numbered among the Popes in seven tables, in the Pope's Library, or in seven as authentic, *ergo* *Leo* the VIIIth was a Pope; from hence may be said, that *Joan* the woman Pope is not numbered amongst the Popes in those seven tables in the Pope's Library: *Ergo* there was no such *Joan*, a woman Pope. But consider if seven tables speaking for a Pope, do not convince the being of such a Pope, why should their silence argue the contrary? Might there not be as well one left out that was a Pope, as commemorate one that never was? Besides, there are several reasons

* Prolegom. 6 in Evangelia.
ad annum 964.

† Annalium, tom. 10.

why

why it was requisite she should be left out; either for her sex sake, being a woman; or else in regard of the foulness of the fact, which as it brands her memory with perpetual infamy, so it cannot but prove a great blot in the muster-roll of Popes.

This omission of her name need not seem strange, if you will but observe, that other Popes upon other occasions, have been past over in silence by several writers as no Popes; as for example, *Felix* the 11d, was both Pope and Martyr, (as * *Bellarmin* affirmed) and he sat as Pope one year, four months, and two days, as you may read in † *Platina*: yet by ‡ *Genebrard's* confession, *Marcellinus* omits to speak of him in his Chronicle, because he was suspected of heresy; and for the same, or such like cause, *St. Austin* and *Optatus* mention him not among the Popes in their Memorials. That one *Cyri* was Pope is acknowledged by divers, yet it is rare to find him in any Catalogue of Popes of whom *Johannes de Paris*, a zealous Papist, in his *Treatise de potestate regia & papali*, writes thus, *Iste Cyriacus*. "Cyriacus is not in the Catalogue of "Popes, because it was thought he left the "poppedom not for devotion, but for the sake "of wenching." *Damascus* the 11d, hath his name registered in many § Popish Chronicles in the throng of Popes; yet there are || many on the other side who let him go for a *scabby sheep*. Thus *Platina*, censent nonnulli, "Some judge this

* Lib. 4. de Roman. pontif. cap. 9. † Invita Felicis.
 ‡ Chronol. lib. 3. ad annum 368. § Platina in vita Damasi 2. Polonus in Chronic. circa an. 1040.
 || Platina loco citato.

" fellow

" fellow no ways fit to be registered among the " Popes ;" and in like manner they deal with many others.

But * some may say if Pope *Joan* was omitted in the registers of some for the filthiness of her fact, why was that close-stool reserved, and that monument of her's erected where she was publicly delivered ; for the stool and the image were as like to continue the memory of her, as any record in writing. To this I answer, may not some be of one opinion, some of another ? May not some think good to continue the memory of that which others for shame would willingly have forgotten ? Have not some Papists in *France* denied that *John Chastel* was taught by the Jesuits to murder *Henry* the IVth of *France* ? And did not others contribute their assistance in the erection of a stony pillar near the king's palace, whereby so much was notified. If any man should affirm, that the same man who omitted Pope *Joan* for the filthiness of her fact, erected such two monuments for her in one of the high-streets in *Rome*, and proscribed such a stool to be kept for that purpose, I know not how he could free himself from contradiction.

† But say the Papists again, grant that Pope *Joan* should be omitted for the filthiness of her fact, yet should there have been mention made of the vacancy of the see for that time she was Pope, else there will be a manifest error in chronology.

A foul error indeed to miss two years in reckoning ; there may be fouler than this, and yet

* Florimondus, cap. 22. page 190.
de Rom. pont. cap. 24.

† Bella. lib. 3.

the matter salved well enough. For *Onuphrius* reckons 230 Popes to *Gregory* the XIIIth, and *Genebrard* and *Massonus* 234, whereas *Platina* accounts 235; for he reckons to *Zifus* the IVth, with whom he ends, 221 Popes; after whom to *Gregory* the XIIIth, every one reckons 14, which compleats the number of 235: yet *Versteganus*, in his table printed at *Antwerp* 1596, numbers no more that 231. Moreover, do not several chronologies written by * Romanists record, that *Evaristus* sat thirteen years, whereas others say, he sat but † nine years; do not ‡ some of them say that *Denis* sat four years, § others that he sat but two years. I think these differences, and such as these, argue manifest errors in their chronologies. If no further inconveniencies follow upon the omission of this female Pope, than a manifest error in chronology, for that space of time when she sat in the chair, we may well enough believe that some omitted her, not because there was no such person, but because they were ashamed of her; for two years and odd months break no square in their chronologies.

But, says *Florimond*, no man ever writ of her, till four hundred years after her death; and is it possible that all writers should so conspire together, that the truth thereof could never be certainly known, till so long a time after the expiration of her popeship?

I have already proved by the books that are yet extant, that this story was sooner discovered.

* Anastas. de Vita Evarist. † Baron. Anal. tom. 2. ad annum 121. Num. 1. ‡ Baron. Annal. tom. 2. ad Anno 172. Num. 21. § Anastas. de vita Dionysii.

But

But suppose we had no author who lived within four hundred years of Pope *Joan* to produce for proof, must therefore this story be rejected? Do not the Papists recommend as truth, many stories for which they can bring no testimony out of any writer who lived within four hundred years after? * They tell us of an image of Christ which was made by *Nicodemus*, who came to our Saviour by night for fear of the *Jews*; and strange miracles have been said to be performed by it; yet are they not able to name the man who wrote of this six hundred years after *Nicodemus*. † They tell us that *St. Luke* drew certain pictures of the Virgin *Mary*, but ‡ *Theodorus Lector* is the first man that makes this report, and he lived at least five hundred years after. Not to trouble the reader with many more instances, § they write, that our Saviour wiping his face with a handkerchief, imprinted his own effigies therein, and sent it to *Agbarus* for a token; but for proof hereof, there is no author to be produced, but || *Eva-*
grius who lived six hundred years after Christ. That the Virgin *Mary* made that coat of our Saviour's which was without seam, the ¶ *Rhe-*
mists peremptorily affirm; and ** others of the like faction add, that as our Saviour grew in height and breadth, so the coat on his back grew in like manner. I cannot read any author

* Bell. lib. 2. de Image, cap. 10. † Bel. loco citato, & Gretzer de Cruce, lib. 2. cap. 1. ‡ Lib. 1. Col-
 lectan. § Baron. Annal. Tom. 1. ad An. Christi, 31.
 Num. 61. || Baron. Annal. Tom. 8. ad An. 594.
 Num. 30. ¶ Annotat. in *John* xix. 23. in Margine.
 ** Ludolphus de vita Jesu, part 2. cap. 63. p. 221.
 Coloss. 2.

they have produced, that writeth hereof for above four hundred years since.

But how comes it about that Pope Joan should be called John, as she was supposed a man after her election, since Popes upon their election do now change their names from a laudable custom (saith Florimondus) that Sergius (a few years before Pope Joan) introduced, which was that the Pope elect should not step out of the conclave till he had changed his proper name.

It is confest, that * some say, that because *Sergius* had a filthy beastly name before his election, viz. *Swines-snout*, he changed it after his election; but they are mistaken who say *Sergius* the II^d changed his proper name, for from his birth he was called *Sergius*, after the name of his father; so writes *Baronius* in his *Annals* tome the tenth, to the year 844. The first who changed his name was *Sergius* the III^d, and yet not for the filthiness of his name, but in reverence to *St. Peter*. His name being *Peter*, he thought it not fit to be called by that name, whereby *Christ* called the first Bishop of that see, even the Prince of the Apostles, whose name he changed from *Simon* to *Peter*, as may be further read in that learned Cardinal *Cæsar Baronius*. Notwithstanding this positive assertion of *Baronius*, I see this great scholar, as well as other bug-bears of wit and controversy, may not only mistake, contradict himself. For (saith he) in another place, *Tom. 10. Annal. ad Ann. 955. Num. 4.* speaking of *John the XIIth*. "This, in truth, is the first who changed his name,

* Fascic. Temp. ad An. 844. Pol. Virg. de Rerum Invent. Stella de vitis Pont. in Sergio. 2.

" who

“ who of *Octavian* would needs be called *John* ;
 “ not that he meant to leave his tyranny, but
 “ to use it in another kind ; for he, who was
 “ called by his father *Octavian*, in respect of his
 “ temporal authority in the city, would now in
 “ respect of his spiritual, be called *John* ; either
 “ because his uncle *John* the XIth was called
 “ so, or for that he desired to hear well at least
 “ for his name sake, whilst in fawning acclama-
 “ tions, the people basely applied unto him
 “ that good speech, *There was a man that was*
 “ *sent from God whose name was John.*” Thus
Baronius, and now *Florimondus*, not knowing al-
 most what to say, ask the question, *who was*
Pope Joan's father, quinam hujus Pseudopontificis
pater : if she had a father, certainly he would
 have been mentioned in history, as well as the
 father of *Linus*, *Clerus*, *Clemens*, and of all the
 rest of the Popes ; in answer hereunto, that the
 histories expressly set down the fathers of all the
 rest of the Popes is false. For by history no
 man knows of what parentage * *Higinus* was,
Higini genealogia non invenitur ; neither can we
 find out the ancestors of Pope *Denis*, as *Anasta-*
sius, afore quoted, doth acknowledge ; *Dionisi*
generationem invenire non potuimus : and it is un-
 known of what surname or country *John* the
 XIXth was : † *Johannis XIX, cognomen & pa-*
tria ignoratur.

In histories it is expressly written, that *Urban*
 the IVth was begotten by a cobbler, ‡ *ex patre*
Sutore veteramentario ; that *John* the XXIIId,

* *Anastasi de vit. Pont. in vita Higinii.* † *Stella de*
vit. Pont. in vita Johani. 19. ‡ *Onuph. Annot. in*
Plat. in vitis Urbani. 4.

was the son of a botcher, * *Filius Veteramentarii, resarcitoris scilicet sotelarium*: that *Benedict* the XIth, was the son of a poor laundress; † *Filius Lotricis pauperulae*: that *Benedict* the XIIth, was the son of a miller; that *Sixtus* the IVth, was the son of a mariner, ‡ *patre ortus qui semper nauticam exercuit*: that *Adrian* the VIth, was the son of a cloth-worker, or as some say a brewer: that § *Sixtus Quintus*, was the son of a swine-herd; but what the names of these men's fathers were, that is not expressly written. || *Alexander* the Vth confessed, *Se nec parentis, nec fratres, nec aliquem ex agnatis, cognatisque suis unquam vidisse*: that he never saw either his father, or mother, or brother, or any of his kindred; who then can tell his father's name?

When driven from this feeble entrenchment, the Romanists fly to another no less ruinous; either this Pope *Joan* was young or old when she was chosen. If she was young, it was contrary to custom to admit of any such election, as may appear by the great number of Popes that lived in the dignity above the number of Emperors that succeeded often in their youth. But if she were old when she was chosen, then how did she bear a child publicly in procession? The ground-work of this argument, that Pope *Joan* was either young or old, may be easily destroyed thus; if we consider that learned men divide the whole course of man's life not into youth and old age, but into *Pueritiam* *puber-*

* Longius in Chron. ad An. 1316.

† Ibid.

‡ Papyr. Mass. de urbis Episcopo lib. 6. in Sixto 4.

§ Cacarellus in Vita 65. || Papyr. Mass. de Urbis Episc. lib. 6. in Alex. 5.

tatem;

tatem; adolescentiam, juventutem constantem mediumve & senectutem. Now middle age is from 35 to 49, whereof she might have been, and so neither old nor young; for *Leo* the Xth was chosen Pope at thirty-eight years of age, being not forty-six years old when he died, and yet he sat as Pope eight years, eight months, and twenty days; and *Gregory* the XIth was about thirty-five years old when he was chosen, as * *Theodoricus de Niem*, and *Massonus* testify; besides, she might have been chosen young for any Popish custom there is to the contrary. For † *Boniface* the IXth, at the age of thirty-four was chosen Pope; and *Innocent* the IIIrd was but thirty. I know not but our *Joan* might have been one of the youths of the parish: for not to speak of the boy Pope ‡ *Benedict* the IXth, who was chosen Pope about twelve years old. I say, not to reflect on him particularly, § *John* XIII, alias XII, *In juvenili & florida etate creatur Pontifex*, he was constituted Pope when he was in his youth and flourishing condition; that is, about the eighteenth year of his age, as || *Baronius* gathereth from circumstances.

But why might she not have been old, since we read, and have known experimentally that old women have borne children. *Henry* the Emperor begat *Frederick* the IIrd, on a wife who was fifty years old, so saith *Massonus*; and *Machutus* the Bishop (saith *Petrus de Natalibus*) was born when his mother was above threescore:

* *Niem Unionis Tract.* 6. cap. 39. † *Masson. de Urbis Episcop.* in *Boniface* 9. ‡ *Glab. Radul. Hist.* lib. 5. § *Paulus Langius* in *Chron. Citizense* ad An. 1389. || *Annal. Tom.* 10. ad anno 955. Num. 3.

and saith *Franciscus Junius* in his annotations on *Ruth*, "A few years since I was intreated to see
 " a woman above fifty-nine years old, who was
 " delivered of two boys at a birth." Why may
 not then Pope *Joan* (though fifty) be delivered
 of a son?

Again let us consider, that the multitude of
 Popes above the Emperors was not by reason of
 their age, but by other accidents. In the first
 three hundred years while the Popes were gene-
 rally good, they were cut off by martyrdom; for
 though it be not true (as *Onuphrius* very well
 observes) that all the Popes from St. *Peter's* time
 to *Sylvester*, were martyrs (which is confidently
 avouched by some of the Romish party) yet I
 grant it for a truth, that most of them were so.
 Now in succeeding times their number grew the
 greater, by their poisoning and murdering one
 another. Diligently peruse the history of their
 lives, and you shall find that of forty Popes de-
 ceased, there was not one sat a full year*. You
 will find that in a little more than nine years,
 there were nine several Popes: you shall find
 that one man in thirteen years, poisoned six
 Popes: lastly, you shall find, that God in his
 justice did cut them off for their wicked and
 abominable lewd lives and conversations.

Liberius sat about six years, saith Cardinal
 † *Turrecremata*, and then died an evil death,
 " he died not for age, but with cursing."

Anastasius the II^d sat not two years, but God
 struck him suddenly for his wickedness, and he
 died miserably: for he died as some say, as

* Fascic. Temp. ad an. 904. † Sum. de Eccles.
 lib. 4. part 1. c. 9.

Arius the Arch-Heretic ; of which opinion is * *Platina* and † *Stella*, who say, "In a house-
" of-office he evacuated his guts with his excre-
" ments."

Clement the II^d continued in the papacy but nine months, and died not of old age, but poi-
son ; so says *Genebrard* and *Æneas Sylvius*.

Damascus the II^d, who had a hand in poison-
ing this *Clement*, kept the popedom but twenty-
three days ; not that he died of old age, but by
the just judgment of God, that he might be an
example to others, (as *Platina* observes) who
climbed to that dignity by unjust and indirect
means, to which they should ascend by virtue
and true merit.

Benedict the VIth lived Pope no longer than a
year and half, and then died in a gaol by strang-
ling or famine, as ‡ *Baronius* is of opinion.

Victor the III^d was no longer Pope but one
year and four months, and died by poison ; so
says *Platina*, *Genebrard*, *Charanza*, and *Polo-
nus* ; by the same means (as is supposed) died
Pius the III^d.

John the XIIIth, (alias XII) was slain in the
very act of adultery, whether thrust through by
one that saw him in that posture, (as *Platina*
believes) or murdered by the devil (as *Luit-
prandus* imagines) Historians agree not in ; but
§ *Turrecremata* a Cardinal, takes that as more
likely, that is most dreadful : for because (saith
he) the life of Pope *John* was detestable, and in-
tolerably offensive to the Christian people,

* *Platina* in vita *Anastasi* 2. † *Stella* de Vit. Pont.
ad annum 498. Annal. Tom. 10. ad anno 974.

§ *Turrecremata* sum. de Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 103.

therefore Christ himself pronounced against him sentence of condemnation: for, whilst he was abusing and vitiating a certain man's wife, the devil struck him suddenly into the temple of his head, and he died as suddenly without repentance.

Boniface the VIIth sat but seven months and a few days, and then the beast died, saith * *Krantius*.

Marcellus the IIId lived but twenty-two days in the papacy, not that he was very aged when he died (for he was but fifty-five years old) but for that he was poisoned, because some thought he would prove an honest Pope, † saith *Genebrard*.

That *Sixtus Quintus*, after the sixth year of his reign, was fetched away by the devil, by whose help he came to that place, ‡ Sir *Francis Breton*, a Monk of the order of the *Celestines*, protested that a Prior of *St. Bennet's Order*, assured him at *Rome*; and the Jesuits at *Italy* seem to believe no less by their own reports. To conclude, it is the confession of many Pontifical writers, that many Popes were short lived, because God saw they proved monsters instead of pious men, and became a shame and scandal to the true religion; wherefore God in his justice snatched them off from the face of the earth. Thus this argument of years hath its answer.

It is again, say they, a most unlikely thing, that the whole Roman Clergy would chuse a Pope without a beard, especially if all the Clergy

* Metrop. lib. 5. cap. 1. † Chron. lib. 4. ad annum 1555.

‡ In his Declarat. made at *Vendome*, Jan. 28, 1601.

in those days, (as some write) were shaven. For men by shaving may make themselves look like women, and women by often shaving may make themselves look like men. * *Johannes Pierius Valerianus*, a learned man, imputes the error of the choice of Pope *Joan* to this, that the Clergy in those days were generally shaven; for “by the means of shaving (saith he) the people were so disguised, that men and women were in a manner undistinguishable; and by this it happened, that a woman was chosen Pope of *Rome*, to the perpetual shame and infamy of that sacred dignity.” Of the same opinion is † *Chalchocondilas*. Thus then since it was an ordinary thing for the Clergy to be shaven, why should they dislike her the more for want of a beard.

But some may say, that this is very strange, that in all that time, neither voice, countenance, nor actions should not discover her. To this I answer, that if there be truth in Popish writers, divers women have lived longer among men in men's apparel unknown, than Dame *Joan* lived in the popedom. For *Marina* (as ‡ *Textor* reports) lived all her life among *Monks* in a masculine habit, and none knew any thing to the contrary but that she was a *Monk*. § *Euphrosina* lived thirty-six years among *Monks*, and was reputed for a *Monk*; so did *Eugenia*, *Pelagia*, and *Margareta*, and their sex the while was unsuspected. In our civil wars, a woman was six-

* Pro barbis Sacerdotum, fol. 21. ad Card. Medicen, Lon. anno 1533.

† Lib. 6. de Rebus Turcicis.

‡ Text. in Officina Tit. Mul. hab. viril. ment. § Pet. de Natal. in Catalog. sanc. lib. 2. cap. 3.

teen years a soldier ; and at length being tired with that kind of life, returned to her relations, and reassuming her pristine habiliments, was in a little time married, and had several children.

The Romanists, to make this story the more fabulous and improbable, say, that certainly this woman Pope (had there been any such person) would not have been guilty of so much indiscretion, (especially having the repute of so much wit and scholarship) as to go abroad in public, being so near her time ; and venture to go in procession, where she must consequently have the eyes of many thousands fixed upon her, whereby, if no other accident should happen, she runs the hazard of a discovery. To this I answer, that the time of child-birth is uncertain ; for commonly women go ten months, yet sometimes they come sooner, at nine, eight, yea, and at seven months, as * physicians have observed. Honester women than Pope *Joan* have fallen in travail upon the highway, nay in the street ; their unexpected pangs have come so fast upon them, that they have been forced to take sanctuary at the next house they could come at, and made bold with a stranger in a mean habitation, rather than be delivered in the street. Suitable to this is an observation of *Theophylact* ; “ A woman (says he) knows she shall be delivered, but the time when, she knows not ; for divers have been delivered in their eighth month, as they have been on a journey, not imagining they were so near their reckoning.” Thus may this poor gentlewoman Pope *Joan* be

* Levin. Lemnius de occult. Nat. miraculis, lib. 4. cap. 22 and 23.

mistaken; and the rather, because this might be her first that she was delivered of; for we do not read, that she had a bastard before she was Pope: but certain it is, she was delivered of a son in the open street, and both expired immediately thereupon, who were buried together without any solemnity; and though she had borne the greatest offices belonging to the Romish Church, yet she was interred without the common ceremonies of burial.

The sacred Scriptures inform us, that God in his justice doth use to serve the greatest princes so who dishonour him. Do we not read that *Jeboiakim* King of *Judah*, was to be buried with the burial of an ass? *Jerem.* xxii. 18, 19. and we read in history, that many Popes have had as ignoble solemnities. *Boniface* the VIIth, (saith * *Baronius*) who sat after *John* the XVth, in four months died a sudden death; and was so hateful to his own followers, that after his death they showed their detestation of him, by revenging themselves with blows on his senseless carcass, whilst others with swords ran him through and through; after this they dragged him by the feet stark naked, till they came to the field which is near the place where *Constantine's* horse stands, there they threw him from them, and so left him. *Deborah*, *Rebekah's* nurse, was buried under an oak; and *Rachel*, *Jacob's* wife, (a far honestier woman than Pope *Joan*) was buried in the way to *Ephrath*. This woman Pope could not have a burial too bad for her; a fact so extraordinary, deserved an extraordinary usage;

* Annal. Tom. 10. ad an. 985. è veteri Pontif. Vaticano codice.

wherefore *Papyrius Massonus* questions the truth of his story, because she was not shameful enough handled; for (saith he) had there been any such Pope, the Romans could have done no less in equity, than after her death, to have hanged her up in chains. But how comes it about, if she was delivered of a boy, that she died instantly? *Florimondus* accounts this, as one of the absurdities which attend this fable. If a woman be once delivered of the fruit of her womb, there is no danger of death in his opinion. In the first place, she did not die instantly, though suddenly, for she was delivered of a boy before her death; in the next place, I would fain know whether it is not common for women to die in child-bed, as well as in child-birth. *Rachael* was delivered of her son *Benjamin*, and yet died shortly after, *Gen.* xxxv. 17, 18. *Phineas's* wife was delivered of her son *Ichabod*, and yet died presently after. And if they died so, why not Pope *Joan*?

But can she be said to have gone from the palace of *St. Peter* to *St. John Lateran*, whereas the Popes laid not then in the *Vatican*, but at *St. John Lateran* itself, this * *Bellarmin* and others do object; and *Platina* (says some) doth justify, that the Popes lay not in the *Vatican* till the year 1350, which was in the time of *Boniface* the IXth.

This is a great mistake, for *Boniface*, the IXth lived in the year 1390, not 1350, the like mistake there is in fathering such a fancy upon † *Platina*. For *Platina* reports only; that the *Vatican* was repaired by *Boniface* the IXth; he saith

* *Bellar. de Rom. Pontif. cap. 24.* † *In Vita Boniface,*

not it was first inhabited by him, though if he had, the Pope might have gone to see the *Lateran*; for he had more than one house to solace himself, and accommodate his retinue in besides the *Lateran*. He dwelt not always in that, for *Gregory* the IVth *, built two stately fabrics for the Pope's use, as *Anastasius* testifies; and *Leo* the IIIId, (as you may read in the same author) built another no less glorious, near to *St. Peter's* church, which stands in the *Vatican*, wherein *Leo* the IVth gave entertainment to *Ludovike* the Emperor. Besides, history doth not mention that she went from *St. Peter's* palace to the palace of the *Lateran*, but from *St. Peter's* church to the *Lateran* church, and yet might dwell in the palace by the *Lateran*; for Popes begin not their procession from the next church adjoining to them. † *Leo* the IIIId appointed to go in procession three several days before *Ascension-day*; and he began the first day at one of *St. Mary's* churches, and ended at *St. Saviour's* church; the second day he began at *St. Sabina* the Martyr's church; and ended at *St. Paul's*; and the third day he began at *St. Croffes* church in *Jerusalem*, and ended at *St. Laurence's* without the walls; so that this objection I conceive is fully answered, and I shall endeavour to do the like to several others: and first, the Romanists cavil much about her different names before her papacy; some say she was called *Agnes*, some *Gilbert*, some *Isabel*, some *Margaret*, some *Tutta*, some *Jutta*, and others *Dorothy*.

* De vitis Pontif. in vita *Gregorii*.
Leonis,

† Platina in vita

This is a meer forgery; for I cannot read in any antient writers, that she was called by any of these names; in some of later time I find some difference, one calling her *Gilbert*, and another *Agnes*; but of all those whom I have here inserted, to assert the truth, and give in evidence against her, there is not above one or two, who either before or after her papacy, give her any other name than *Joan*.

Secondly, They say, that some of these authors I have alledged to vindicate this truth, do clash and differ in opinion, some calling her *John* the VIIth, some *John* the VIIIth, and others *John* the IXth, and so saith *Baronius*.

Baronius, by his leave, quotes no author for his assertion, and therefore I must beg his pardon if I believe him not; for my belief shall extend in this no farther than reason shall direct it. Besides, whether she be *John* the VIIth or VIIIth, the difference is not so great, for the like may be demonstrated in other Popes, whom the Romish party cannot deny to be Popes. But who styles her *John* the VIIth, or *John* the VIIIth, assuredly, neither *Marianus*, *Scotus*, *Sigibert*, *Goteфридus*, *Viterbiensis*, *Polonus*, *Platina*, *Palmerius*, *Trithemius*, *Fasciculus Temporum*, *Krantius*, *Alfonfus à Carthagena*, nor *Textor*, call her neither *John* the VIIth, nor *John* the VIIIth, but plainly *John* or *Joan*. *Onuphrius* indeed would persuade the credulous, that *Platina* styles her *John* the VIIIth, in these terms; " This *John* questionless is the eighth, not the ninth, " as *Platina* accounts him; for though *John* " the Woman, whom he talks of, had been Pope, " yet

“ yet seeing she was not capable of priesthood,
 “ she should not go for one in the number.”

This is another falsity; for *Platina* calls her not *John* the VIIIth, and therefore *Onuphrius*, or some person else, hath abused him: for proof whereof, I appeal to * *Platina*, printed in the year 1481, which was the year wherein *Platina* died; and to the next edition 1481, who speaking of *John* the woman in those antient editions, he places no numeral note on her head, but begins his story thus, *John English* born at *Mentze*, &c. neither styles he the next 9, but 8; for coming to that Pope's life, he saith, *John* the VIIIth, by his country a Roman, &c. for further proof of which later point, I appeal to the later editions, whereunto *Onuphrius* † his annotations are annexed; for though we read thus in them, *Johannes nonus Patria Romanus*, &c. yet that reading is false, and the antient reading true, appears by that which is written of the next Pope's life, to wit, *Martin* the IIId, even in those later editions: For ‡ *Platina* shewing how *Martin* lived in the time of *Charles* the IIIId, adds presently, *Quem ab Johanne VIII, Coronem accepisse scripsimus*. Now *Charles* the IIIId was crowned by *John* next before *Martin*, according to *Platina*, wherefore the next before *Martin* was *John* the VIIIth, according to the opinion of the same man, and not *John* the IXth, as *Onuphrius* would have us believe. Which oversight or fraud of *Onuphrius* was not so great, but that by this means he is forced to alter

* *Platina* moritur Romæ, Anno 1481. Trithem. de Script. Ecclesiast. verbo *Bartholomæi*. † Such as that of *Colen*. 1574. ‡ De vitis Pontif. in vita *Martini*.

Platina's numeral note, set to all the *Johns* that follow to call him *John* the Xth, whom *Platina* calls *John* the IXth; to call him the XIth, whom *Platina* calls the Xth, and so unto the last *Baldesar Cossa*, who was in the number of *Johns* according to ancient editions the XXIIId, and not XXIVth, as he is numbered in the editions which *Onuphrius* comments upon.

Now, whereas the Romanists do alledge that the disagreeing of authors about the time wherein she commenced her papacy, and the time of her continuance therein, is an argument to prove the nullity of this story, I say; no such matter: in the first place, let them consider the disagreement that is among themselves. Some that have written of Pope *Lucius*, say he was a * *Roman*, some a † *Tuscan*, some say he was the ‡ son of *Lucinus*, and others of ¶ *Porphyry*. Some say he was chosen Pope in the year 253, some 254, some 259, and others 275. Some say he sat 3 years, 3 months, and 3 days; some 3 years, and 5 months; and some 3 years, 7 months, and 6 days; which you may find in the authors quoted in the margin, and yet no man denies that *Lucius* was Pope.

Again, do we not read the same difference in the reign of *Sergius* the IIIId; some will have it begin in § 905, others in ** 907, &c. some write that he succeeded †† *Benedict* the IVth, others that he followed ‡‡ *Formosus*, others

* *Platina* in vita *Lucii*. † *Anastasius* in vita *Lucii*.
‡ Idem. ibid. ¶ *Plat.* & *Onuph.* loco citato. § *Mat.*
West. Flores Hist. ad ann. 905. ** *Polon.* in *Chron.* ad
an. 907. †† *Herm.* contractus circa an. 907. ‡‡ *Luit-*
prandi Cron.

* *Christopher*, &c. yet, whoever denied that there was such a Pope.

We read that the carcass of *Formosus* † was taken up out of his grave by one of his successors, and brought into judgment before a council of bishops, and that it was divested of its papal robes, and clad with a layman's garment; that it was indicted, arraigned, and condemned: but among those that report this, there is a great disagreement. For some say it was taken up by *Sergius* the IIIId, some by *Steven* the VIth, some say it had two fingers cut off, some three; some say the head was chopt off, and some deny it; some say the trunk was thrown into *Tyber*, and some say it had lay-man's burial; and yet who of the Romanists will deny the truth of this story, by reason of these differences. *Onuphrius* denies it point blank, saying, "The report which goes concerning the digging up *Formosus's* body out of his grave by some of his successors, are questionless fabulous and not true, which is apparent by the disagreement and disconveniencies which are to be found among them who write of it." Notwithstanding the manifold differences in circumstances, *Baronius* durst not cast it off, as *Onuphrius*. For he ingenuously confesseth, it was such a villainous prank, as was never played before: ‡ *Intentatum hætenus scelus*, and by reason of its barbarousness incredible; *præ sui immanitate omnibus incredibile*; yet he grants it true, and avows that they foully err, who deny what was done

* *Baron. Annal.* † *Baron. An. Tom. 10. ad an. 897.*

‡ *Annal. Tom. 10. ad an. 897. Num. 3.*

to the carcass of *Formosus*. * *Bellarmin* saith true in this; that "It often happens, that men
 " are sure such a thing is done, when yet they
 " are not sure of the manner how it was done;
 " or of some other like circumstance." The difference among writers about circumstance, doth not weaken any man's argument touching the substance: if it do, I would have the Romanists for shame blot out St. *Ursula*, and her fellow holy-day out of their † *Kalendar*, and all the prayers they make to them in their primers, portesses, and breviaries; for there was never greater disagreement among the relators of any story, than among the relaters of that. Some say, that *Ursula* was the King of *Scotland's* daughter; others say the King of *Cornwall's* daughter; some say her father was called *Maurus*, others *Dionethus*, or *Dionatus*, or *Dionicius*: the husband she was to marry, some say, was King of *Little Britain*; and one calls him *Ætherius*, another *Holofernes*, and a third *Conanus*. Now in her company they say there were only 11000 ladies, all virgins; others say there were 60000 country maidens over and above: besides, there were divers bishops, and lords temporal, who accompanied them: nay *Cyriacus*, the Pope of *Rome*, like a good fellow, and a trusty *Trojan*, left his papacy, and followed these Pilgrims, as some say, though others deny it. For some say they went in pilgrimage to *Rome*, though others do not hold that probable; some say they were martyred on the sea-coast; some say before the gates of *Colen*. Last.

* Lib. 2. de Rom. Pont. cap. 5. † October 21.

ly, some say that if any be buried in St. *Ursula's* church, though they be infants newly baptized, the ground will cast them up again; though others say that that is a tale of a tub, and others say it is as horrid a lie as e'er was framed.

But to proceed; our adversaries do say, that *Athens* was utterly destroyed at that time, when it was storied *John English*, afterwards Pope *Joan* travelled thither with her learned companion, to study arts and sciences. I utterly deny this: for *Paulus * Æmilius* writes, that *Gotefridus* was made Duke of *Athens*, and Prince of *Achaia*, about the year 1220; and afterwards that certain pirates invading the country of *Greece*, slew the Duke of *Athens*, who was of the House of *Brennas*, and took the city. In like manner we read in † *Mat. Paris*, the Popish Historian, that *Johannes de Basingstocks*, Arch-deacon of *Legria*, who died in the year 1252, studied at *Athens*, and that there he learned many things unknown to the western churches. Besides *Aeneas Sylvus*, who lived since that, affirms that in his time *Athens* was not totally demolished, but had the appearance of a pretty town. So that the exception aforesaid, doth no way prejudice the truth of this story.

From this slender shelter I pursue them to another, which is grounded on what *C. Bellarmin* writes, *That there were no schools for learning at that time, neither in Athens, nor any part of Greece.* This he endeavours to prove, first by *Synefius*, who lived a little after St. *Basil's* and *Nazianzen's* time, who ‡ writ to his brother

* Lib. 8. † In *Hen. III.* ad an. 1252. page 1112.
‡ In *Epist. ult.* ad fratrem suum.

that

that *Athens* retained only the bare name of an university. And secondly, he makes use of *Zonorus* and *Cedrenus* to back the former; who record, that in the sole reign of *Michael* the Emperor, about the year 856, *Bernardus Caesar* restored learning, *Cum usque ad illud tempus per annos plurimos ita fuissent extincta omnia studia sapientia in Græcia, ut ne vestigium quidem ullem extaret.*

And doth this imply, that in *Synefius's* opinion there was no university at *Athens*: I am of the opinion that *Synefius* meant thereby, that *Athens* was an university, though nothing near so famous and flourishing as heretofore; questionless when * *St. Bernard* writ, that *Peter Abalard* had nothing of a Monk, but the name, and the cowl, his meaning was not that *Peter* was no Monk, but a sorry one. And I am the rather induced to understand the words of *Synefius* to be so; because *Athens* in *St. Basil's* time (about 40 years before *Synefius*) was held the mother of learning, and therefore called *Golden Athens* by *Greg. † Nazianzen*. For who could think in so few years, learning should be at an end, and that so famous an university should in so short a time be utterly decayed; but suppose there was no university in *Athens* in *Synefius's* time; what is that to prove there was no university in *Pope Joan's* time at *Athens*, which was four hundred years after? That university might revive, and get new life in so many years, as it did; for two years after *Synefius's* time, *Boethius* went to study at

* *Bernardi* Epist. 193. † *Baron. Annal. Tom. 3. ad an. 354.* ‡ In *Monodia* in *Bas. Magni vitam.*

Athens,

Athens, teste Baronio; adding further, that the study of philosophy was revived there in those days.

As for *Cedrenus*, and *Zonaras*, *Bellarmin* wrongs them both in bringing them into witness, that there were no schools in any part of *Grecia* in Pope *Joan's* time. For they say no more, but that learning was not regarded a long time before *Bardus Cæsar*; they do not say that it was quite extinct, but almost: *Philosophia neglecta jacebat, ac probè omnino extincta erat, ut ne scintilla quidem ejus appareret.* *Bardus Cæsar* added life to it, by erecting schools for all the liberal sciences, and appointing public Professors, and giving them stipends out of the Exchequer, as *Cedrenus* and *Zonaras* write; but certainly he raised it not up simply to life; for had it had no being at that time, how could he so suddenly have gotten professors to furnish his schools? We may read in *Zonaras*, that at the same time there was a noted Philosopher called *Lea*, who studied at *Constantinople*, and had to his scholars many skilful Mathematicians. Nor can it be denied, that about the year 680, a general council was held at *Constantinople*, wherein there were many eminent bishops of *Greece*, and among the rest the * bishop of *Athens*. There was another council, kept at † *Nice*, a hundred years after, at which there were more bishops of *Greece*, than at the former. There was a third council held at *Constantinople*, which in number exceeded either of the former two, about the year † 870; and how then is it credible, that so many

* Conc. Const. 6. A.D. 17. † Bellar. lib. 1. de Conc. cap. 5. ‡ Bellarm. loco citat.

councils consisting of many bishops should be kept in Greece, and yet Greece utterly without learning.

Now as these abusers of truth deny that there was any learning at that time in Greece, so they will not allow that there was any open profession of learning in those days in Rome, because they would deny the fact of Pope Joan's going thither; and that as she professed publicly all manner of learning, whereby the greatest doctors there became her scholars, so she preached, and wonderfully engaged the ears and hearts of her auditors.

* History makes it appear, that *Ina* (one of our Saxon Kings) built a school in Rome, a little before the days of Pope Joan in the year 727; that the Kings of England, and their children, the bishops, priests, and the rest of the clergy might repair thither to be instructed in the Catholic faith, and afterwards return home; which school flourished in the reign of King *Offa*, 795, and continued at least till *Alfred's* time. For we read, that *Marinus*, who was Pope in 883, freed it from all payments at the request of *Alfred*. Now is it likely that such a school was built, and maintained for such a purpose, where no learning was publicly professed? Moreover, we read of many other schools kept in the same city, in the time of *Stephen the Vith*, in the year 885. For all the schools in Rome with alacrity concurred, and brought *Stephen the Vith* to the palace of *Lateran*, and *Stephen* was troubled he had not wherewith

* *Mat. Westmon. Flores Hist. ad an. 777.* † *Ibid. ad an. 794.*

to gratify them; thus saith *Anastasius* in the life of this Pope: and is it reasonable to believe, these schools were without masters, readers, and professors?

But Cardinal *Banonius* thinks to bury this story in perpetual oblivion; thus, saith he, if *Leo the IVth* lived to the year 855, then *Marianus Scotus*, the first promoter of this story, told a manifest untruth, in reporting that this *Joan* was chosen Pope in the year 853; for by his confession she succeeded *Leo the IVth*, but *Leo the IVth* lived to the year 855; Ergo, *Marianus Scotus* lyes, &c.

It were easy to see the fallacy of this Cardinal; for these are not *Marianus's* words, for he sets not down the year precisely, but in numeral figures in the margin. * And it is plain by conference of years, that he meant to note out the 855 for her entrance, and not the 853. For *Benedict the IIIrd*, who succeeded her, entered not by his account till the year 857; now if she had entered in 853, she had been Pope four years, or thereabouts; whereas he plainly notes, that she was Pope but two years, five months, and four days. Secondly, it is plain by *Marianus Scotus*, that *Sergius the IIrd* began his Popedom in the year 844, and sat three years; and it is as plain, that *Leo the IVth*, next successor to *Sergius*, began his in the year 847, and sat eight years; now add these three odd sums to 840, and the product will be 855; so that whoever succeeded *Leo the IVth*, must begin in the year 855, and that was *Joan*, the woman Pope in *Marianus's* opinion.

* Whoever will consult *Marianus's* chronicle will be thoroughly satisfied.

* *Florimondus* would make us believe, that the moon is made of green-cheese; for, (says he) we read nothing in history of her reforming the church, of her determining of causes and questions usually proposed by bishops to them that are Popes; of any intercourse or affairs that she had with King or Emperor; wherefore certainly, had there been any such *Joan* a Pope, her actions, as well as her bare name, would have been registered by historians.

He might as well question, whether there ever was an *Anastasius* the III^d, who sat two years and upwards, and yet no historian tells what he did in that affair; only † *Platina* writes, he acted nothing worth commemoration. We read of no great matter done by *Leo* the VIIth, who sat three years, six months, and was as very a drone as the other, for any thing we read; he neither reformed the church, nor resolved any bishop his doubts, nor intermeddled with the affairs of princes: and whereas the author aforesaid may pretend, that in that age wherein Pope *Joan* lived, there were great controversies between the *east* and *western* church; that in it many princes and emperors reigned, who were as much signalized for their virtue, as royal dignity; that in it many men of great learning lived, and therefore if there had been any such monster then, they could not have past her by in silence. No more they did, as I have already proved; neither was there more variety of matter fell out in that age, than ordinary; though some would have us believe, that be-

† *Flor.* in c. 25. n^o. 31. † *Platina* in vita *Anastasi* 3.
nil memoria dignum gestum est.

tween the *eastern* and *western* churches, there was a great controversy, and contention about images, and that many councils were held, &c. This is a positive untruth; for all stories testify, that the difference between those two churches about images, began in the former ages; and that though they continued some few years in the beginning of the 9th century, yet there was no talk of that matter for several years before Pope *Joan's* days. And as for the learned men of that age, *Baronius* gives this account of them: "Those passed for learned men in that age, who were but bare Grammarians;" and therefore were there never so many, Pope *Joan's* acts might pass unwritten *.

If again, it be urged that this female Pontiff crowned no kings or emperors, neither did every other Pope perform the ceremony of inauguration. But we read that she gave orders, she consecrated bishops, she administered the sacraments, and performed all other offices belonging to the Papacy; this truth is testified not only by *John Bale*, but by † *Cornelius Agrippa*, a man highly commended by ‡ *Leo* the Xth, and in a book of his solemnly privileged by *Charles* the Vth.

And let me not forget to answer one grand objection more, which the Papists alledge against the truth of this story; *Ratio ineluctabilis*, saith *Genebrard* in his chronology, and this is it. || About a hundred and seventy years after this

* *Baron. Annal. Tom. 9. ad an. 802. Num. 12.*
 † *De vanitate Scient. cap. 62. de sectis Monasticis.*
 ‡ *Lib. 1. Epistol. Epist. 38. || Leo IX. Epist. ad Mi. bacl. Episc. Constantinop. cap. 23.*

invented fabulous election of Pope *John*, in the year of our Lord 1020, the church; and the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, being in some contention with *Rome*, *Leo* the IXth wrote a letter to *Michael* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, reprehending certain abuses of that church; and among others, that they were said to have promoted Eunuchs to priesthood, and thereby also a greater inconvenience fallen out, that a woman had craftily crept in to be a Patriarch. Now no doubt (say they) *Leo* would never have durst to write thus, if the Patriarch might have retorted upon him that this was but a slanderous report, falsely raised against the church of *Constantinople*; but that a woman indeed, had been promoted to the Pontificate at *Rome*.

To shew this is not an unanswerable argument, we need only observe, that it is not unusual with Papists to object that against others, of which they themselves stand most guilty; and with the vulgar Proverb, to cry *wh—o first*. They have exclaimed, for instance, against the clergy of *England* for incontinency; and yet is it not well known, how their Priests and Monks, like * fed horses, have neighed after their neighbours wives, and their nuns have opened their feet (to use the † Prophet's phrase when he speaketh of such) to every one that passed by, and have multiplied their whoredoms. *Taceo de fornicationibus*, &c. saith ‡ *Nich. Clemangis*, speaking of the Romish priests. I say nothing of your priests fornications and adulteries, from

* *Jerem. vi. 8.* † *Ezek. xvi. 25.* ‡ *De Prasulibus Simoniacis in Bibliotheca Patrum. Paris 1576. p. 655.*

which

which crimes, if any man be free, he is made a laughing-stock to the rest.

Laici usque adeo persuasum habent, saith the same man. The lay-people are so convinced of the incontinence of all priests, that, willingly they would not admit of a parish priest, unless he have a concubine of his own, that so they might preserve the chastity of their own wives, nor is even that found an adequate security.

Fornicantur complures, saith *Theodoricus de Alem.* Secretary to Pope Urban the VIth. Nuns commit fornication with bishops, monks, and converts, and are delivered of sons and daughters within their monasteries, which were got by those persons fornicator-like, if not incestuously, and which is most to be lamented, very many of these nuns by internal receptions destroy the fruit of their womb, and many kill them after they are born.

* *Quid obsecro*—"What, I beseech you, are
" nunneries, but cursed stews, and meeting-
" places for wanton and shameless youth to
" satisfy their lusts in? So that now it is all one
" to make a wench a nun, and to make her a
" whore."

† *Johannes Cremensis*, a Romish Cardinal, held a council at London in the year 1125, wherein he inveighed bitterly against such priests as kept concubines, meaning lawful wives, saying, *summum scelus*: "it was a damnable sin for
" a priest to arise from the side of a whore, and
" go and administer the body of Christ."

* *Clemangis de corrupto Eccles. statu.* † *He. Huntingdon, Hist. Lib. 7. ad ann. 1125. Roger Hoveden Annal. pars prior in Hen. I. 1126.*

Whereas, dire to tell, he himself was found that night in bed with a prostitute after he had said mass.

Again, they condemn us of ignorance, saying, we dare not dispute with them in matter of religion; and if any of us are so confident, we are easily baffled, being not able to produce so many arguments in our own defence as our adversaries do for us, applauding themselves, and debasing us; and yet it is easy to prove, that their priests and monks are generally like the three-score thousand Ninevites, who had not so much wit as to discern between their left hand and their right.

Videas admitti in Sacerdotium, &c. saith *Clemangis*, speaking of the ignorant of the Romish Clergy, "You may see ignorant and illiterate persons advanced to the priesthood and other holy orders;" and farther complains, how many are there now a-days preferred to bishopricks, who so much as cursorily have neither read, or heard, or learned the holy Scriptures; and *seculo* (saith *Duaremus*) * "In this age bishopricks and parsonages are bestowed on most unlearned and irreligious men, in scripture knowledge far inferior to the Laity." *Pudeat Italia*, saith *Aeneas Sylv.* † It is a shame to *Italy* that her Priests never read over the New Testament; and as another says, *Ecclesiarum regimina*, the government of the churches, even at *Rome*, is committed to unwor-

* De Sac. eccles. Minist. Benef. lib. 1. cap. 11.
† Comment. de dictis & fact. Alfons. Regis lib. 2. Apopthegm. 17.

thy persons, who are fitter to look to the keeping of mules than men.

* *Clemangis* speaking of the *Roman* worthies, saith, *Siquis desidiosus est*, &c. "If there be any

"lazy fellow, one that will not work, but in-

"dulge his senses, he is restless till he is be-

"priested; and when he is made one, and hath

"gotten a benefice, he consorts with his fellow

"priests as sensual as himself, and then he and

"they live more like epicures than christians;

"drinking, eating, reveling, playing, damning,

"and fighting; whilst others, as they come

"reaking hot from filthy carnal defilements,

"address themselves to the Holy Altar."

Asciscuntur ruit, (saith † *Platina*) "Now

"a days, not only servants and vulgar persons

"are admitted to be of the Clergy, but every

"vile fellow, and the offspring of such like

"persons."

"The worst of courtiers, forlorn and bloody

"soldiers (a thing never heard of before among

"christians) are all on a sudden thrust in upon

"the church to manage it in God's stead; yea,

"boys and youngsters are made bishops and

"prelates in the church," saith † *Lindan*.

The Bishop of *Dunkeld*, in *Scotland*, thanked

God that he knew nothing either of the Old or

New Testament: a circumstance so notorious,

that his ignorance (of which he was so little

ashamed) became afterwards proverbial. To

these testimonies, I shall only add, for the rea-

der's further entertainment, a saying of an Arch-

bishop of *Mentz*, which is still upon record.

* *De corrupto Eccles. statu.* † *In vita Sozimi.*

† *Panopliæ lib. 4. cap. 77. p. 405.*

Having

Whereas, dire to tell, he himself was found that night in bed with a prostitute after he had said mass.

Again, they condemn us of ignorance, saying, we dare not dispute with them in matter of religion; and if any of us are so confident, we are easily baffled, being not able to produce so many arguments in our own defence as our adversaries do for us, applauding themselves, and debasing us; and yet it is easy to prove, that their priests and monks are generally like the threescore thousand Ninevites, who had not so much wit as to discern between their left hand and their right.

Videas admitti in Sacerdotium, &c. saith Clemangis, speaking of the ignorant of the Romish Clergy, "You may see ignorant and illiterate persons advanced to the priesthood and other holy orders;" and farther complains, how many are there now a-days preferred to bishopricks, who so much as cursorily have neither read, or heard, or learned the holy Scriptures; and *seculo* (saith Duarenus) * "In this age bishopricks and parsonages are bestowed on most unlearned and irreligious men, in scripture knowledge far inferior to the Laity." *Pudeat Italia*, saith Aeneas Sylv. † It is a shame to Italy that her Priests never read over the New Testament; and as another says, *Ecclesiarum regimina*, the government of the churches, even at Rome, is committed to unwor-

* De Sac. eccles. Ministr. Benef. lib. 1. cap. 11.

† Comment. de dictis & fact. Alfons. Regis lib. 2. Apophthegm. 17.

thy persons, who are fitter to look to the keeping of mules than men.

Clemens speaking of the Roman worthies, saith, *Siquis desidiosus est*, &c. "If there be any lazy fellow, one that will not work, but indulge his senses, he is restless till he is be-priested; and when he is made one, and hath gotten a benefice, he consorts with his fellow priests as sensual as himself, and then he and they live more like epicures than christians; drinking, eating, reveling, playing, damning, and fighting; whilst others, as they come reaking hot from filthy carnal defilements, address themselves to the Holy Altar."

Asciscuntur nunc, (saith † *Platina*) "Now a days, not only servants and vulgar persons are admitted to be of the Clergy, but every vile fellow, and the offspring of such like persons."

"The worst of courtiers, forlorn and bloody soldiers (a thing never heard of before among christians) are all on a sudden thrust in upon the church to manage it in God's stead; yea, boys and youngsters are made bishops and prelates in the church," saith † *Lindan*.

The Bishop of *Dunkeld*, in *Scotland*, thanked God that he knew nothing either of the Old or New Testament: a circumstance so notorious, that his ignorance (of which he was so little ashamed) became afterwards proverbial. To these testimonies, I shall only add, for the reader's further entertainment, a saying of an Archbishop of *Mentz*, which is still upon record.

De corrupto Eccles. statu. † In vita Sozimi.
† Panopliæ lib. 4. cap. 77. p. 405.

Having

Having accidentally met with a Bible, and being asked what book he was perusing, he answered, that he could not tell; but that he concluded it must be some heretical performance, as the Doctrine it contained was the very reverse to that of the Church of Rome.

But as the Papists tax us with ignorance, so they do with falsehood, of which they themselves are most guilty. For instance, * *Agatho* a Pope avoucheth, that the *Roman* Church never swerved from the tradition of the Apostles; that she never gave ear to novelties; that the Pope's predecessors had ever boldly strengthened their brethren according to Christ's commandment to *Peter*; for proof hereof, he appeals to all the world. In like manner † *Pope Nicholas* boasts, that none of the Popes was ever suspected to have held an error; whereas *Victor* was supposed to have held, that Christ was pure man and not God, which is attested by ‡ *Eusebius*: *Zepherinus* was suspected of *Montanism*, so saith § *Tertullian*: *Marcellinus* sacrificed to idols according to || *Damasus*, and acknowledged by *Bellarmin*, though denied in part by *Baronius*. *Liberius* subscribed to *Arian's* heresy, so says *Athanasius*, *Jerome* and *Sozomen*; and to be short, that *Honorius* the Ist was a *Monothelite*, and for that condemned by name in the sixth and seventh general councils; not to mention *Pope Leo X.* boasting that the church was enriched by the fable of Christ. From hence I gather, that *Pope Agatho* was not infallible in his judg-

* In Epistola 1. ad Imperatorem. † In Epistola 1. ad Michaelcm. ‡ Hist. Eccl. lib. 5. cap. 28. § Contra Praxeam. || In Pontificali in vita Marcelli.

ment, neither am I apt to believe that the sons of that church are less fallible. It is not their bare saying that this is so, and that not so, but the proof they produce must be considered as to its validity.

And now the Papists, at a loss what to say for themselves, suggest this, * that though men at that time had been so far bewitched or mope-eyed, as not to distinguish a man from a woman, yet God himself, who appointed and ordained the seat of *Peter* to be the rule and direction of the whole church, should never have departed so far from his merciful Providence, as to suffer the same to be polluted by a woman incapacitated for holy orders, and a *Putana Ex-trante* to boot.

I would willingly understand, why might not the Almighty suffer that church to be polluted by a woman, as by so many monsters and beasts of men, as several pontifical writers have discovered, who ingenuously have confessed the wild actions of their brethren, to their everlasting shame and infamy. Why might she not sit there as well as † *Sabinian*, whom though a Pope, on account of his wicked life, I cannot call by a name bad enough; and as he lived sinfully, he died fearfully. Why might she not sit there as well as *Stephen* the VIth, who digged up the carcass of Pope *Formosus* his predecessor; and, as if living, had it arraigned before a council of bishops, and condemned, &c. as I have before recited. Why might she not sit there as

* Onuph. Annotat. in Plat. in vita *Johan.* 8. *Harding* in his answer to Bp. *Jewel's* Apology. † Fascicul. Temp. ad an. 614.

well as * *Boniface* the VIIth, who robbed *St. Peter's* church, and fled for a time to *Constantinople*; who afterwards by simony, and the murder of two Popes, got into the papacy; who in mischief, excelled all the ruffians and banditties of his time for cruelty; and for the ruin of his country *Sylla*, and *Catiline* come short of him. Thus much † *Baronius* confesses; and at length as he lived like a brute, so he died like a beast: these are his words, *Bonifacius VII, annumerandus inter Famulos latrones & potentissimos grassatores atque patriæ proditores Syllas & Catilinas horumque similes, quos omnes superavit sacrilegus iste turpissima nece duorum Pontificum.* And why might she not sit there as well as *Sylvester* the II, that notorious forcerer, who gave himself both body and soul to the devil, that he might get the popedom; and whilst living, was hurried away whither no mortal ever yet could tell. *Platina*, in the Lives of the Popes, writes thus of him. "*Sylvester* the II, being damnably ambitious, got first by bribery the archbishoprick of *Rheims*, then that of *Ravenna*, and after that, by the devil's help, the bishoprick of *Rome*; yet upon this condition; that when he died, he should be wholly his by whose means he had attained such dignity." *Sigibert* confesseth in a manner the same thing, for he saith, he got the popedom by indirect course, for he was suspected of necromancy: the like is affirmed by Cardinal ‡ *Benno*, by § *Martinus Polonus*, by || *Stella* a *Venetian*, by

* *Plat. in vita Bonif.* † *Annal. Tom. 10. ad annum 985. num. 1.* ‡ *De vita & gestis Hildebrandi.* § *In Chron. ad an. 1007.* || *De vitis Pontif. in Sylvest. 2.*

* *Philippus Bergomensis*, by † *Ranulfus Cestrensis*, by *Matthæus Westmonasteriensis*, *Fasciculus Temporum*, by *Charanza*, and by *Aeneas Sylvius*.

William of Malmſbury, having related the ſame ſtory in effect with the above-named writers, ſuppoſeth that ſome might reply, this is but a made tale, becauſe the common people are wont to ſay, that ſcholars, who are ſingular or excellent in any thing, are cunning men, or deal with the devil: yet he concludes, that he believes it for truth; for † ſaith he, “ I am verily perſuaded *Sylveſter* was ſuch a villain, “ becauſe of the ſtrangenefs of his death.” For why ſhould the butcherly fellow have torn his own fleſh as he did, but that he was guilty of ſome ſtrange ſin.

To proceed, why might not Pope *Joan* ſit in the papal chair as well as *Benedict* the IXth, that blackeſt of monſters, as *Platina* calls him, *Terrimum Monſtrum*, who got the popedom when he was twelve years old, § who when he was caſt out for his unworthineſs by ſtrong hand, got it again within few days after; and for fear he could not keep it long, ſold it to another for money; who after his death appeared partly like an aſs, partly like a bear, confeſſing that he carried ſuch a ſhape, becauſe he lived ſo much like a beaſt in his life.

Why might he not ſit in *St. Peter's* chair as well as || *Boniſace* the VIIIth, who when accord-

* Supplement. Chron. ad annum 997.

† In Polychron. lib. 6. cap. 14. &c.

‡ Rerum Aug. cap. 10. fol. 36.

§ Sigonius de Regno Italiae, lib. 8. ad annum 1048.

|| Pet. Crinitus de honesta diſcip. lib. 8. cap. 13.

† In

Lib. 2. de geſſis

§ Sigonius de Regno

|| Pet. Crinitus de

ing to custom on *Ash-Wednesday*, he should have laid ashes upon an archbishop's head, and religiously told him, that he was but ashes, and should return to ashes, he cast them in the archbishop's face and eyes, maliciously telling him that he was a *Gibelline*, and that he should die with the *Gibellines*; of whom *Cælestine* his predecessor, a man famous as they say for miracles, * prophesied that as he entered like a fox, he should reign like a lion, and die like a dog, which fell out accordingly.

Why might he not fit there as well as *Gregory* the VIIth, commonly known by the name of *Hildebrand*, who set the † church and commonwealth on fire; who hired a villain to tumble down great stones from the battlements of a church upon the Emperor's head, to crush him to pieces, whilst he was at prayers, as Cardinal *Benno* reports; who cast the Sacrament into the fire; who usually carried about him a conjuring-book; who soundly basted his predecessor *Alexander*; who wrested the scriptures to cover his lewdness; ‡ who at his death confessed, that the devil set him on work to provoke God to wrath against the world.

Why might he not fit there as well as *John* the XXIIIrd, (*Onuph. Appendix* 24.) who was fitter for a camp, than for the church; for profaneness, than for piety; as knowing no faith, no religion at all; who openly professed that

* Ascendisti ut vulpus, regnabis ut Leo, morieris ut Canis, & ita sane contigit, *Ibo. Walsingham* in *Edux.*
 † Abbas *Uspbergenfis* in *Chron.* ad an. 1086. ‡ *Florentinus Vigornienfis* in *Chron.* page 64. *Mat. Paris* in *Guil. Conquest.* an. 1086.

there was no life after this, but that it was with men as with beasts; who, in a word, lived so scandalously, that he was commonly called the devil incarnate.

Why might she not sit there as well as *John* the XIIth, who made deacons in a stable; who made a boy of ten years old a bishop; who made the *Lateran* a common bawdy-house; who drank to the devil; who, when he was at prayers, invoked *Jupiter* and *Venus*, and other idolatrous Gods of the heathens; who at length was slain even by the devil himself, whilst he was committing adultery, as I said before. If it cannot be denied that God hath suffered these, and as many as wicked as any of these (except the last recited) to seat themselves in *St. Peter's* chair, as they call it, we need not wonder with *† Antonius*, at the story of Pope *Joan*.

And now let me ask any Romanist this question, How should this tale of Pope *Joan* arise, if there had not been such a Pope? Was there ever such a smok and no fire; such a report and no probability? To this some Romanists reply, that great lies always arise out of some truth: *Omnia insignia mendacia ab aliqua veritate originem habent*, saith *Onuphrius* in his notes on *Platina* in the life of Pope *Joan*; and so did this, confessing that *John* the XIIth was a whore-master, and among other of his *Bona Roba's*, there was one called *Joan*, who was all in all with him. Now the people perceiving what interest she had in, and power over him, in contempt of him, gave her the appellation of

* Luitprand. Hist. de Europ. gestarum, lib. 6. cap. 7, 8, & 10. † Part 2. Tit. 16. cap. 1. sect. 7.

Pope. Whereupon the church's enemies took occasion to slander the church, as though the church had (indeed) a woman Pope. And this * *Onuphrius* proves out of *Luitprandus Ticinensis*, a writer of that age; who affirms, that *John* the XIIth had three famous strapping concubines, of whom the handsomest, and consequently the best beloved, was called *Joan*. In answer hereunto, I read in † *Luitprandus*, in the place cited by *Onuphrius*, that *John* the XIIth kept one eminent whore whom he called *Raynera*, whom he made governess of many cities, and on whom he bestowed many golden crosses, and chalices belonging to St. *Peter's* church; and relates further, that he kept another called *Stephana*; and that he debauched and vitiated married wives, widows, and virgins, who came to visit the apostolical churches; and withal writes, that he kept a third called *Anna*, who was a widow, and that he kept her niece to boot, making the palace *Lateran* no better than a brothel; but he no where mentions any *Joan*, on whom that continent and worthy head of the Romish Church *John* the XIIth doted. *Onuphrius* then, we are to suppose, wanting spectacles, mistook *Joanna* for *Anna*.

But say some, *John* the IXth was made bishop of *Bononia*, then of *Ravenna*, and at last Pope of *Rome*, by the means of one *Theodora*, a famous strumpet, who in those days at *Rome*, ruled all affairs ecclesiastical or political. Now it being generally observed how prevalent this *Theodora* was with this *John*, and how much a slave he

* Loca supra citato. . . † Lib. 2. cap. 6 & 7. 2. 8

was to all her humours and commands, he was concluded to have deserved rather the name of a woman than a man, and therefore they called him *Joan*, for *John*; and upon this arose the report of Pope *Joan*: and to back this assertion, * *Aventinus*, a German, is produced; but *Genebrard*, who is a profest rigid Papist, differs in opinion; for saith he, *Aventinus*, lib. 4. *Annal.* holdeth that this tale arose by reason of a noble whore called *Theodora*; but I think some later sycophantising parasites of the emperor, invented this story to discredit the papal seat: I know not but that *Genebrard* may be as authentic as *Aventinus*, since he spent † ten whole years upon his chronicle.

Besides, suppose we allow that *John* who was first bishop of *Bononia*, then of *Ravenna*, and lastly of *Rome*, came to those bishopricks by the means of *Theodora*; on which account, Cardinal *Baronius* questions whether he was a Pope or not, and terms him some times † *Pseudopontifex*, and *Anti-papa*, a false Pope, and *Anti-pope*, & sometimes an intruder and an usurper of the apostolical chair; yet I deny that this was *John* the IXth, but *John* the Xth: *John* the IXth took no indirect courses to gain the papacy, but lawfully and honestly, and died naturally, as the said || Cardinal reports: but so did not this. ‡ This confirmed a child under five years of age in the arch-bishoprick of *Rheims*; at which fact *Baronius* stands amazed,

* *Annal.* l. 4. † *Præfatio Chronog. ad Pontacum.*
 ‡ *Annal. ad an. 912. num. 12.* § *Ad annum 923. num. 2.* || *Annal. Tom. 10. ad annum 901. num. 1.*
 † *Frodoard Hist. Rheim. lib. 4. cap. 19.*

and could not forbear saying, "That there was
" never a filthier fellow than this." This entered with infamy and died fearfully; this was stifled with a pillow, by the procurement of one as famous for whoredom as *Theodore* who preserved him.

Now suppose he was *John* the IXth, if his loose carriage with *Theodora* gave occasion of the report of a woman Pope, why was it not recorded, as happening in his time, but above forty years before his time; *John* the IXth was constituted Pope in the year 901, yet this Story is recorded as happening about the year 854; to this the *Romanists* reply, that this came to pass by the subtlety of the reporters; for say * they, about the year 800, the Empress, who in a manner ruled all the world, was called *Theodora*. Now these trifling tale-tellers (to use their own words) hearing of a Pope *Joan* in *Theodora's* time, chopt it into the time of *Theodora* the Empress, who lived about thirty years before *Theodora* the harlot.

I do think this rather argues simplicity than subtlety in the reporters; for *Cui bono*, whether it happened in the one or the other *Theodora's* time? But it carries no colour of truth with it; for *Theodora* the Empress never carried any sway in *Rome* at all. At *Constantinople* for a while, in the time of her son's minority, she had great power; † but in Pope *Joan's* time she was turned out of office, or divested of that power she had assumed in *Constantinople*; nay, she was deposed of her regency, and thrust into

* Florimond. cap. 39. num. 8.
Tem. 10. ad an. 855.

† Baron. annual.

a monastery, where she was detained till the expiration of her life.

Now, since this fallacy will stand them in no stead, they imagine this tale, as they call it, arose from *John* the VIIIth; for *John* the VIIIth, say they, behaved himself not like a man to *Photius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, but sheepishly and like a woman; for he received *Photius* into communion, who was excommunicated by his predecessors. *John* the VIIIth suffered himself to be overcome by half a man, whereupon, in reproach, he was called, not *Papa sed Papissa*; and this they father on *Baronius*, of which he writes in his annals; but how justly let any judge, since he is one of those who affirm that the rumour of the church of *Constantinople's* oversight, in suffering a woman to creep in to be patriarch, occasioned this tale against *Rome*; according to his own words, saith *Baronius* in his annals, "who is so ignorant, that understands not that
" what was reported of *Constantinople*, the same
" was turned by schismatics as spoken against
" *Rome*?"

With what honesty can he affirm both, since * he acknowledges if there had been but some flying tale of any such accident at *Rome* in former days, Pope *Leo* should first have cleared it, before he had charged the church of *Constantinople* with the like. And was there not such a flying report of a woman Pope before *Leo* the IXth's time, in *Baronius's* time? How then did *John* the VIIIth occasion such a report who lived a hundred and forty years before *Leo*.

* Annal. Tom. 10. ad annum 853. num. 66.

Many more objections I could here insert, and answer, but that I think I have produced enough already, to convince any unbiassed person of the reality and the truth of this story, that there was a Pope *Joan*. But suppose this story to be true, what prejudice is this to the church of *Rome*? Yes, very much; for if she was Pope, then it will necessarily follow, that the *Roman* Church was once headless; for the church, according to * *Bellarmin*, is defined to be a company of Christian-men professing one faith, under one head, to wit, the Pope; but she, however she carried the name of Pope, was no genuine Pope; † for a woman is not capable of Holy Orders; wherefore a woman cannot play the Pope; therefore all the time of Pope *Joan*, the *Roman* Church was without a head.

The Papists acknowledge this for a great inconvenience, that the church should want a true head for the time; but that is not so great a matter cry they; for so she doth when any Pope dieth, till another be chosen. If this be granted, what a pitiful case is the church in then? Since Christ's time above 250 Popes, and by consequence, then the church hath been headless 250 times; yea, and sometimes between the death of one Pope, and the choosing of another, there have passed many days, many months, and some years, as you may read in history, and particularly *Bodin*, that after *Felix*, sometimes duke of *Savoy*, St. *Peter's* chair stood empty ten years. Now, if the church be headless, where lies her

* *Bellar.* lib. 3. de Ecclesia, cap. 2.
annot. in 1 *Cor.* xiv. 2.

† *Rhem.*

understanding; what shall guide her when she is bereaved of her head?

But let us weigh another objection; did not (say they) St. *Austin* hold this opinion upon supposition of a like case, that the Church of Christ should not be prejudiced? Did not * he, having recited the Popes names from the time of Christ to his days, make this demand? What if any *Judas* or *Traitor* had entered among these, or been chosen by the error of men? and answereth presently, *Non præjudicaret Ecclesiae, & innocentibus Christianis.* According to the body of the Popish doctrine this must be denied; for the Papists hold that the Pope is head of the church, and that it is necessary to salvation to acknowledge him the head; but so did not St. *Austin*. The Papists hold that in a true church, one bishop must lawfully succeed another, or all is dashed out; but so did not St. *Austin*, for he puts the case, that some traitor *subrepisset*, that is, had come in not orderly into the bishop of *Rome's* seat; and yet resolves that that was not prejudicial to God's Church. Let the Papist conform himself in these two points of the Pope's headship and succession to St. *Austin's* judgment, and then he may better say in this case of Pope *Joan*, that which St. *Austin* said in the case proposed, that she had not prejudiced the Church of Christ.

Now if it be true that there was a Pope *Joan*, the Church of *Rome* must be discarded as no true church; for thus I argue, that is no true church which cannot give in plain authentical writing, the lawful, orderly, entire, (without any breach)

* *Austin*. Epist. 165. ad literas cujusdam Donatist.

and sound sincere succession of bishops; but your church if *Joan* was Pope, cannot give in plain authentical writing, the lawful, orderly, entire, &c. For by reason of her, *Benedict* the IIIId could not orderly succeed *Leo* the IVth, for she was a bar to his succession; by her a breach was made in the rank of Popes; and as she was a notorious whore, so she was no fool; as she shamefully baffled the doctors with her learning, so she out-witted them with her policy, and sat in that seat which properly belonged to men, to the confusion of the *Romish* Church, and perpetual infamy of her clergy.

Lastly, if it be granted there was such a Pope, then Popish Priests may well doubt of the lawfulness of their mission, and Lay-Priests of the sufficiency of their absolutions which the priests give them on auricular confession, and of the truth of the real presence and transubstantiation. * For unless the Popish Priests be admitted by a lawful bishop, their priesthood is insignificant and of no effect: † unless Lay-Papists be absolved by a lawful priest, their absolution is nothing worth; and ‡ unless the words of consecration be uttered by a lawful priest, intent upon his business, there follows no substantial change in the creatures of bread and wine. Now how can the priests say they were inducted by lawful bishops, or the layman absolved by lawful priests, or masses said by them, seeing we read (as I said before) that Pope *Joan* gave orders, Pope *Joan* made deacons, priests, bi-

* Tolet. *summa Casuum Conscientiæ*, lib. 1. cap. 1.
 † Concil Trident Sess. 14. Can. 10. ‡ *Bellar.* 1. 4.
 de Eucha. cap. 16.

shops,

shöps, and abbots. For it may be well enough supposed, that the priests of this present age are descended from those who received orders from her. Her successors dealt not with her shavelings, as Pope *John* the XIIth did with *Leo* the VIIIth his shavelings. *John* the XIIth degraded them all, and compelled every one of them to subscribe a paper, wherein was writ *Episcopus meus* (meaning *Leo* the VIIIth) *nihil sibi habuit, nihil mihi dedit*, he had nought for himself, and gave nought to me: but so did not *Benedict*, the IIIrd with Pope *Joan*. To what hath been said, I know not what any *Romanist* in any probability can reply, unless he says as lawyers in the case of *Barbarissus Philippus*, *Communis error facit jus*; yet that will not serve the turn; for though it may be so in matters of the commonwealth, yet in affairs of the church the case is widely different; for an error in the beginning touching the church, proves often an heresy in conclusion. In matters of the church, prescription gives no credit to actions of evil beginning.

To conclude; though the temper of Papists is too well known, that we should disbelieve a thing, merely because for their own interest they deny it, it may not be amiss here to subjoin a catalogue of such authors as have recorded this fact in question; all and every of whom are true sons of the *Roman Church*, men of learning, and for the most part of dignity amongst them.

1. *Marianus Scotus*, born anno 1028, about 170 years after Pope *Joan*. He had the best opportunities of knowing the truth, and more reason than others for declaring it; he being a

Monk of that same monastery of *Fulda*, where the said *Joan* had her education; and might be tempted through vain-glory, as he might think it for the credit of his convent.

2. *Sigebert*.

3. *Otto Frisingensis*, grandson to *Henry IV.*

4. *Geoffry* of *Monmouth*.

5. *Godefridus Viterbiensis*, chaplain to the Imperial court, 1186.

6. *Martinus Polonus*, archbishop of *Gnesna*, and penitentiary to Pope *Innocent IV.* 1290.

7. *Johannes Parisiensis*, a *Dominican*, 1290.

8. Bishop *Bernard Guido*, 1331.

9. *Ranulphus*, of *Higden* in *Cheshire*, died 1363.

10. *William Ockham*, the famous Schoolman, father of the *Nominalists*, died 1347.

11. *Antoninus*, archbishop of *Florence*, 1459, afterwards canonized by *Adrian VI.*

12. The ingenious *J. Boceace*, 1376, in his book of illustrious women.

13. *Francis Petrarch*, that witty *Florentine*, canon of the Church of *Padua*, 1374. *Lib. de Pontif. & Imp.*

14. *Theodoric*, a *Niem*, in his *Privileges and Rights of the Empire*, 1414.

15. *Matth. Palmerius*, reckoned by *Tritemius* amongst the famous men of the council of *Florence*, in his *Chronicle* down to 1449.

16. *William Brevin*, 1470, who likewise mentions the subsequent expedition of the *Chaise Percée*.

17. *Roderic Sanchez*, bishop and governor of the castle of *St. Angelo*, 1464.

18. *Platina*.

19. *Ful-*

19. *Fulgofus*, duke of *Genoa*, Mem. Actis, l. B. c. 3. 1483.
20. *Wermarus*, a *Carthusian* friar, 1494.
21. *Martinus*, a *Minorite*, ditto.
22. *Bergomas*, an *Augustine* friar, their contemporary, in his Supplem. Chron. l. ii. & de claris Mulieribus, c. 143.
23. *Hartmannus Schedel Norimbergensis*, physician at *Padua*. Series of Popes.
24. *Coccinus Sabellicus*.
25. *Naucherus*, Provost of *Tubing*. 1500.
26. *Raphael Volaterranus*, 1503. Anthropol. l. 22.
27. *Johannes Lucidus*, Chron. 1510.
28. *Stella*, a *Venetian* priest, in his Lives of Popes.
29. *Johannes Major*, a *Dutchman*, in his Promptuary of the Councils, published 1511.
30. *Krantzius*, dean of *Hamburg*, in his Metropol. l. 2.
31. *Johannes Mantuan*, General of the *Carmelite* Friars, 1513.
32. The most learned *Johannes Tritheimus*, Abbot of *Spanheim*, 1519.
33. *Johannes Lasiardus*, 1520, in Epitom. Hist. c. 3.
34. *Christianus Maffæus*, priest of the order of *St. Jerome*, in *Ghent*.
35. *Cælius Rhodiginus*, in Antiqu. Lect. l. 14. c. 1.
36. *Johannes Episcopus Cbemensis*, Onus Ecclesiæ, c. 19. sect. 4.
37. *Nicholaus Ægidius*, secretary to the French king.

38. *Henry*

38. *Henry Cornelius Agrippa*, Knt. Doctor of Laws, a Judge in the Imperial Court, and much praised by Pope *Leo X.* Ep. 38. See his *Vanity of Sciences*, c. 26.
39. *Annals of Aquitain*, part 2.
40. *Jobannes Ravisius Textor*, 1530. *Officina*. Tit. *Fœm. habit. viril. mentitæ*.
41. *F. Amandus Ziriczæus*, *Chron. Antwerp*, 1534.
42. *Achilles Firmianus Gassar*, an eminent physician, 1536. *Epitom. Hist.*
43. *Leander Albertus*, a *Dominican*, 1550, in his *Descript. of Italy*.
44. *Marcus Guæzzus's Chronicle*, published by permission, 1553.
45. *Petrus Mexias*, a *Spanish Knight*, about the same time, in his *Divers. Lect.* p. 1. c. 6.
46. *Alphonfus à Castro*, a *Minorite Friar*, famous amongst the divines at the *Trent Conventicle*, in his 2d B. of the *Just Punishment of Hereticks*.
47. *Jobannes Novio Magus*, his continuation of *Bede*, of the *Six Ages*.
48. *Dominicus à Solo*, Confessor to *Charles V.* and President at the University of *Salamanca*, died 1560, in 4 Dist. 15. q. 1. Art. 2.
49. *Richard Wasseburg*, Archidiaconus. *Eccles. Virdun.* 1570. *Antiq. Belg.* l. 3.
50. *Bartholomæw Carranza*, Archbishop of *Toledo*, 1575, next in dignity to the Pope, *Summ. Concil.*
51. *John Tarcagnota*, in his *Chron.*
52. *Bernardus Giraldu Hallanius*, *Hist. Franc.* 1590.
53. *Petrus Belloius*, in *Med. Abus.* 1586.
54. *Nico-*

54. *Nicolaus Dolionus*, 1510. *Antiq.* l. 9.

c. 56.

55. *Stephanus Paschasius*, *Disquis.* Franc. l.

3. c. 4. & l. 6. c. 5.

56. *Johannes Pannónius*, *Quinqueeclesiensis Episcopus*, in his Epigram on Pope Paul the II^d, 1500.

57. *Marullus* in his Epigram on Innocent the VIIIth.

58. *Jo. Marcouville*, *De Vitup. & laudibus* *Fœm.* c. 4.

59. We have the testimony of three whole Universities, as famed as any in the world; *Oxford*, *Paris*, and *Prague*, in their Epistle directed to all at Rome, printed by *Haldericus Hutton*, 1520.

60. *Chronicon Saxoniz*, cited in the Centuries of *Magdeburgh*.

61. *Chronicon Cbronicorum*,

62. *Valerius Anselmus Rid*,

63. *Constantius Phrygio*,

64. *Liber Rythmicus Willelmi Monachi*.

65. *J. Bapt. Egnatius*, l. 3. c. 3.

} Quoted by
Bishop
Jewel.

In all these of the *Latin* Communion, might be added some of the *Greek* Church; as *Barlaam*, of the order of *St. Basil*, 1303, in his *B. de primatu Papæ*; and,

Lonicus Chalcocondylas, an *Athenian*, 1460, de *rebus Turcicis*, l. 6.

Thus is the truth and certainty of this fact, amply confirmed by the attestation of the most learned writers of several distinct and remote nations, *Italians*, *Spaniards*, *French*, *Germans*, *Polanders*, *Scotch*, *English*, and all genuine sons of the Church of *Rome*. Not one Protestant among

among them. Men who lived in different ages, and most of them before the modern controversies came into dispute.

What fuller evidence, may it well be asked, can possibly be adduced for any matter of fact, after the interval of above nine hundred years? Where shall we find a more numerous or concurrent testimony for any occurrence of antiquity? Upon what grounds will he expect to be credited himself, who will not believe such a cloud of witnesses? Must it not now be a capacious arrogancy to question it? Or can any thing besides impudence, joined with self-interest, deny it?

Habeat jam Roma Pudorem,

ROME'S

ROME'S BURNING ARTICLE,

OR THE

Impious and absurd DOCTRINE of TRANSUB-
STANTIATION confuted.

THE Papists pretend, (and require you under pain of death in this world, and eternal damnation in the next, to believe) that as soon as the Priest, in administering the Sacrament of the Eucharist, has pronounced the words of Consecration, the *bread* is turned into the very *body of Christ*, and the *wine* into his *blood*, so as Jesus Christ is there *corporally*, and his whole body (flesh, blood, and bones, born of the Virgin *Mary*) received into the mouth of each communicant, under the accidents of bread and wine. To this I answer,

I. In holy Scripture there is no such thing taught. It is true, there is a *sacramental phrase*, — *This is my body*; but similar expressions we find made use of in the Sacraments of the Old Law: *This is my covenant*, Gen. xvii. 10. *This is the Lord's passover*, Exod. xii. 11. *The rock was Christ*, 1 Cor. x. 4. which yet no man ever received in such a strict literal sense, or dreamed that there was a conversion of one substance into another.

II. Our Creed affirms Christ to be in heaven, and that thence we are to expect his coming, when he shall appear to judge the quick

and

and the dead; and the Scriptures declare, that the heaven of *heavens* must contain him till that day; therefore his corporeal presence here daily on earth, is no part of our faith, but contrary thereto.

III. It is absurd and against *reason* for a true body, and continued quantity to be in two places, yea, in a thousand at once: that Christ should hold his *whole self* in his *own hands*, and yet his *whole* body at the same time be in the mouth of every one of his disciples.

IV. The angel's reason to *Mary*, *Matt. xxviii. 6.* confutes this gross opinion; for he said to her, when she, with the other *Mary* came to seek Christ in the sepulchre, *He is not here, for he is risen*; that is, he is not, he *cannot* be in this place, BECAUSE he is elsewhere in another; so that if Christ's body could have been in *two* places at once, the angel's argument had been of no force; but this was *angelical logick*, and the contrary is false and diabolical, denying our Saviour's *humanity*, and representing his body as not a true body, which is blasphemy.

V. This opinion is against all our senses: we neither see, feel, nor taste flesh and blood. Whenever God vouchsafes to work a miracle, by turning one substance into another, the conversion is evident to the *senses*. *Moses's staff* became a *serpent*, dust *lice*, the water was made *blood*, amongst the *Egyptians*, but all these transmutations were evident to the senses; and when our Lord changed water into *wine*, it had the colour, fragrantcy, and taste of wine, inso-much that the guests could discern by their *palates*,

lates, that it was better wine than what they drank before.

VI. The body of Christ, as a true body, is discernible by sense to be a *true body* wheresoever it is; therefore when his disciples doubted at his appearing, he said, *Luke xxiv. 39. It is I myself*; and to prove this, bids them use their senses, saying, *Handle me and see*; that so they might discern his true body, flesh and bones; and so, by parity of reason, might it be said to be discernible in the Sacrament, were Christ there corporally present.

VII. It destroys the nature of a *sacrament*, that the *sign* should be the *thing* signified, and thwarts the express words of the institution,—*Do this in remembrance of me*; for we cannot be said to do a thing in *remembrance* of one, when the party is bodily present.

VIII. This doctrine of the *Romanists* hath been witnessed against by a noble army of *martyrs*; but let them shew any one on their side that ever suffered for it. The truth is, it was never heard of in the Church for many centuries, but was invented by idle schoolmen not above seven hundred years ago, and has been since fostered and promoted as it tends to magnify the *priesthood*, and conciliates their mass-mongers a great esteem and veneration amongst the people, whereby suck they no small advantage.

IX. As this opinion of our adversaries is to be opposed for its *falsehood*, and abhorred for the bloody *cruelty*, which, for the upholding it, hath been committed upon many hundred thousands of God's saints, so, most of all is it to be detested for the gross idolatry thereby committed,

led, in adoring even a piece of bread instead of Christ himself, as is their daily practice:

Thus it appears, that this great *darling* doctrine of the *Roman* Church is against Scripture, against the Creed, against Reason, against Sense, repugnant to the nature of a Sacrament, testified against by the *blood of martyrs*, an upstart chimera, politickly contrived, maintained by diabolical *cruelty*, and the direct cause of damnable *idolatry*. He that well considers this, and has any sense of a God, of religion, and of a future state, let him believe Transubstantiation, that is, let him *be a Papist* if he dare.

But as the *Romanists* are ever desirous of availing themselves of the smallest semblance of a miracle, in order to justify their innovations, it may not be altogether foreign to the present purpose, to lay before the reader a most memorable testimony of God on the behalf of his truth relative to the subject in hand, as it may be found related by that faithful minister of Christ, Monsieur *Pineton*, a great and long sufferer under the Papal Tyranny, in the Principality of *Orange*.

This learned Gentleman, having related the deplorable ravages made on the subjects of the Prince of *Orange*, by the arms of *France*, which at length advanced to the total suppression of the exercise of the Reformed Religion in that principality; he goes on, in his book entitled *Les Larmes de Jacques Pineton de Chambrun*, p. 9. 10. in these words: *Je ferois tort au public, &c.*—In *English* thus—“And here I should
“do wrong to the publick, if I should omit one
“passage which deserves to be translated to
“posterity.

“ posterity. One of the fore-mentioned Gen-
 “ tlemen (the Jesuits) preaching on the octave
 “ of their holy Sacrament, in the year 1678,
 “ challenged me in his pulpit to make answer
 “ to the arguments which he then produced, to
 “ prove the *real presence* of Christ’s body, and
 “ to justify the adoration of the Sacrament.

“ There was one who gave me an exact re-
 “ lation of all that he advanced : but I made
 “ light of it for some time, and had no thoughts
 “ of making him any reply ; contenting myself
 “ to give satisfaction to such as made any re-
 “ port of his sermon. But at last, seeing that
 “ he provoked one from day to day, and that
 “ my people desired with passion that I should
 “ return him an answer ; I undertook one
 “ Lord’s day, in the evening exercise, to refute
 “ all the sermons which he had made on that
 “ subject. I preached above four hours, not
 “ only in the presence of my usual congrega-
 “ tion, but of many strangers who came to take
 “ cognizance of this refutation. I may say that
 “ I put him into a furious disorder, by unfold-
 “ ing his false reasonings, and false quotations.
 “ I overwhelmed him with passages of the Fa-
 “ thers, about whom he had made such offen-
 “ tation. So that going from my sermon, he
 “ fell to tearing of his hair, and said to a gen-
 “ tleman of the *Roman Communion* now liv-
 “ ing, whose name is *Villeneuve*, *Alas ! I know*
 “ *not where I am. Good God ! how shall I be*
 “ *able to answer so many quotations ?*

“ Indeed, he took sufficient care not to at-
 “ tempt to follow me ; but contented himself
 “ to make divers exclamations in his pulpit,

“ about my affirming that the adoration of the
 “ Sacrament was an *idolatrous worship*. And
 “ he believed that he might somewhat extricate
 “ himself from this affair by his prophetick
 “ apostrophe, which I give you in his own
 “ words.

“ Great God, why suffer you your worship, the
 “ most august and most holy to be treated as idola-
 “ trous? If it be true (as these ministers accuse
 “ us) that we are idolaters, and that the priests
 “ are impostors, when they say that they daily sa-
 “ crifice the body of your well-beloved Son; where
 “ are your thunders, where are your thunder-bolts
 “ to crush these idolaters?

“ And in the sequel, turning himself to-
 “ wards the altar where the Host was exposed,
 “ he continued his apostrophe in these words:
 “ Yea, my Saviour! I address myself unto you, to
 “ demand of you, that you judge our cause by
 “ some miracle: If we are idolaters in adoring
 “ your holy Sacrament, make the fire of heaven to
 “ fall upon us, as *Elijah* did upon the priests of
 “ *Baal*. THUNDERSTRIKE OUR ALTARS, and
 “ then you will undeceive us, and persuade us in-
 “ deed, by such a judgment, that we are idolaters.

“ It was precisely on the nineteenth of June,
 “ 1678, that he pronounced this imprecation:
 “ and just ten days after, namely, on the twen-
 “ ty-ninth of the same month, being the feast
 “ of *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, being then upon
 “ *Wednesday*, about nine in the morning, God
 “ manifested the miracle which this Jesuit had
 “ demanded. The heavens grew dark by rea-
 “ son of thick clouds, flashes of lightning shone
 “ in all parts, thunders roared with a very ex-

“ traordinary noise; and there was one strange
“ thunder-clap, whose shock fell just by that
“ great altar towards which the Jesuit had di-
“ rected his apostrophe, and where the Canon
“ *Caulet* then celebrated mass. The clap of
“ thunder threw him down upon his back; it
“ tore up several stones of the vault; and pas-
“ sing into the first chapel, which is on the left
“ hand of the choir, burnt the cloth of the
“ altar to powder, where one celebrated the
“ mass also at the same time. The lady *de la*
“ *Pisa*, who was on her knees, was much hurt
“ with it, and all covered with dust, with many
“ other persons. They carried the said lady
“ half dead to her house, where she was speedily
“ blooded; and the thunderbolt which was the
“ cause of all this disorder, going forth through
“ a window of the church, fastened to the
“ tower, where they laboured till the evening
“ to extinguish the fire which it had kindled.

“ BEHOLD here a very positive matter of
“ fact, known throughout the principality of
“ *Orange*, and all the neighbouring places there-
“ about; which ought to bring all sober Ro-
“ man Catholicks to a serious consideration of
“ the matter.”

F I N I S.

